THEOLOGY

A Monthly Journal of Historic Christianity

Edited by the Rev. E. G. Selwyn, B.D., Redhill Rectory, Havant, to whom all editorial matters should be addressed.

Vol. XII APRIL, 1926 No. 70

EDITORIAL

ACCORDING TO ST. JOHN*

One of the happiest features of Anglican theology has been the extent to which it has from time to time enlisted in its service the intellectual gifts of laymen. Sir Thomas Browne, Coleridge, Gladstone, Sir John Seeley are names that occur to us at once, two of them at any rate connected with theological books that have a permanent place in English literature. And these outstanding names were the symbol of a very much larger number of students and writers in this field, whose work lay in humbler spheres, but was none the less of great value. One may cite, for example, the admirable little edition of *The Acts* by that distinguished scholar and Charterhouse master, Mr. T. E. Page. Whether this tradition of lay theology will revive again one cannot tell. It was closely associated with the predominant position which the Classics held in higher education, and which made it natural for men of culture to extend their interests to the Greek and Latin documents of early Christianity. Probably no one would deny that the decline of this tradition has been a very serious loss to the Church. All the more welcome, therefore, will be any evidences, if not of a turn of the tide, at least of individual laymen who do not accept the facile assumption that divinity is the concern of the clergy only, and are not prepared to make a present of it to purely technical scholars.

Lord Charnwood's book *According to St. John* is such an evidence, and is also very much more. Those who have read his *Abraham Lincoln* and his slighter essay entitled *Theodore Roosevelt* will not be surprised at this. The present writer remembers hearing Mr. Roosevelt speak about twenty years

* *According to St. John.* By Lord Charnwood. Hodder and Stoughton. 10s. 6d.

ago at the Cambridge Union. He was fresh from his big-game tour in East Africa, and had come to tell us something of his experience of life. Needless to say, his discourse was breezy, full of meat, and full of fun; but the climax was when he summed up his philosophy of life in four words. Speaking of those who asked him during his Presidency whether he did not find the burden of responsibility almost overwhelming, he said that he always made one reply: "I like my job." There was a salt of moral earnestness in the words which brought the House to its feet. Is it that, perhaps, which has made it natural for Lord Charnwood to turn from the lives of these two great Americans to a study of the Fourth Evangelist? The subject-matter of any study has a curious way of imposing itself upon the mind of the student; and it is significant that throughout these three books there runs not only a clearly-marked style, but also a clearly-marked interest—the interest in concrete historical character, moulding and being moulded by environment and having to decide, on real and not doctrinaire grounds, what it is most right to do.

A peculiar human interest, therefore, attaches to Lord Charnwood's treatment both of the Fourth Evangelist himself and of the Divine Subject of his Gospel. The chapter entitled "The Man St. John" is a portrait at once convincing and delightful, full of insight and delicate understanding. It is the kind of matter which "critical" scholars for the most part neglect; and yet how wrongly! Lord Charnwood inclines to agree with the late Dr. Stanton that the Gospel is not the work of the son of Zebedee himself, but of one of his friends and disciples: hence the ἐκεῖνος in xix. 35, referring to the eye-witness, St. John, who is the recorder but not the writer. But in that case the character of this St. John is obviously of the utmost importance to our understanding of the Gospel; and he stands out in these pages with impressive individuality.

We rather suspect that Lord Charnwood has read every book of importance on the Fourth Gospel which has appeared in recent years; but he is modestly careful not to tell us so. Many of them at any rate he evidently regards as suffering from a kind of squint. Particularly effective is his criticism of the use made in recent years of the tenth-century writer "picturesquely called George the Sinner," who attributes to Papias the statement that St. John had been killed by the Jews. The seriousness attached by some scholars to this tenth-century remark has always seemed to us extraordinary and wholly out of colour with the treatment

accorded to patristic sayings generally, if they happen to be of a more traditional type. Lord Charnwood at any rate makes short work of it. Even if George is right about Papias's statement, various questions fall to be asked.

> "Did not Christians often, as they did in the case of our Lord ('whom ye slew,' etc.), speak of a person as killed by the Jews when the Jews had instigated the official Roman persecutor against him, as it is probable that they often did? And, lastly, may not Papias, whose unlovable credulity blended traditions of some worth with chatter that was silly and obscene, have accepted uncritically, thirty years after the event, just that sort of baseless legend which most of ourselves have heard gravely repeated about the death of Lord Kitchener? This evidence, too, is nothing."

One of the most effective chapters is that on "This Gospel as History." Of its relation to St. Mark he writes with great judgment. On the one hand: "We cannot quite measure how far the Fourth Evangelist may not have been ready to go beyond his historical data in pointing his broad historical truth; but this need not keep us from attending to him when he evidently means to correct an earlier historical view." On the other: "Rather tiresome attempts have been made to magnify the slight discrepancies [with regard to the Baptist] between St. Mark and the later Evangelist. These are well within the ordinary limits of divergence between any two genuine accounts given long after of the same transaction." On this last point, indeed, one might go further and say that the Johannine narrative represents with extraordinary fidelity that position in relation to Himself which our Lord asserts in the Synoptic record in the words, "Verily I say unto you, Among them that are born of women there hath not risen a greater than John the Baptist: notwithstanding he that is least in the kingdom of heaven is greater than he" (Matt. xi. 11). Or we may turn to a still more vexed question—that of the ethical temper of the discourses as recorded in St. John viii. Our author comes up to this question three times in different chapters, and we are not sure that he ever quite allays our sense of difficulty, even in his ninth chapter. On the other hand, his treatment there is really helpful, since he shows that the "repugnance" we feel to certain passages in St. John viii. is only a symptom of a still larger contrast between the Fourth Gospel and the others. Not only are these passages hard in themselves; but throughout these middle reaches of the Gospel we miss certain dominant notes of the Synoptic Jesus—the gift of "practical counsel in detail," for instance, or the emphasis on "mercy," "compassion," "forgiveness"; and these omissions go quite as far as the hard

passages to create our problem. Its solution, as Lord Charnwood implies, lies somewhere in that region which divides the son of Zebedee from his interpreter. Evidence does not at present permit us to walk that ground with any sureness of foot, and perhaps it never will. For the time perhaps we cannot do better than walk, as our author does, with the kind of circumspection of men who move in the dark. Yet even in the dark it is possible to make progress.

The later chapters of this book are concerned with Christian origins more generally, including a discussion of the alleged influence on them of the Mystery cults; and an Epilogue contains a *confessio fidei* which is not the least striking feature of the volume. It gives us the clue to much that has gone before, showing us our author as bringing to his task not only wide human interest and common sense, but also a strong and practical faith in the Deity of our Lord. The result is a study of the Fourth Gospel from a clearly-marked point of view; and though some scholars will feel that there are aspects of their work which Lord Charnwood has dismissed too easily, the preponderant opinion, we believe, will be that his point of view is one which can never be out of date in the interpretation of St. John; and we foresee for this book a wide vogue and a continuing value.

NOTE.—The appeal appearing in our advertisement columns on behalf of St. Stephen's House, Oxford, coincides with a special effort being made to secure fresh annual support for this Theological College, which this year celebrates the jubilee of its foundation by Bishop King; and it is proposed to form a "Society of St. Stephen," whose members will undertake to support the House with their prayers and alms. We understand that St. Stephen's House has made steady progress since the war, and all expenses involved in the developments of the last six years have been met; but the number of applicants is still growing, and additional accommodation and a new Chapel are therefore necessary, if the House is to respond to the opportunity. We hope that the appeal will be warmly supported.

CHRIST IN US

A STUDY IN THE FOURTH GOSPEL

One of the characteristics of the nineteenth century was the tendency of criticism to read into ancient literature the peculiar conceptions of modern thought. The critic seemed unable to divest himself of the system in which he had been schooled. He lacked the imaginative power to throw himself back across the centuries to live for the moment in ancestral ages—breathing the air, growing pregnant with the thought, imbuing his soul with the spirit of the past; and thus much of the historical criticism of the last century has lost its validity for us. Even Chamberlain's finer decisions are marred by this habit of viewing everything from the platform of modern Teutonic culture, and the novelist who so powerfully dramatized *Hypatia* obviously failed to rid himself of the typical English puritanism of his day.

But this spirit infecting the work of the older generation is not yet dead. And, despite the insistent claim of a substantial section of recent scholarship to the right to be called "modern," modernism is often synonymous with sheer inability to visualize the life that underlies the dry bones of history. It is not only in the reconstruction of Hebrew history that this fault asserts itself. We see it particularly in New Testament criticism. We find traces of it even in the writings of so fine a "Hellenist" as Dr. Percy Gardner, where, in his brilliant work on the *Ephesian Gospel*, he makes the arbitrary assumption that John the Apostle could not have been the author of the book that bears his name. The ground of the learned scholar (on which he by no means stands alone) is, in brief, that—

> "It is, indeed, very doubtful whether John, the fisherman of Galilee, would have had sufficient literary training to write any continuous composition, above all a composition in a language so little familiar to the Galilean peasants as Greek."*

He later follows this by the logical idea that the author of the Gospel must have been a cultured Jewish gentleman thoroughly familiar with Greek thought as it prevailed in Ephesus. Dr. Gardner's book is the most exquisite interpretation of "the spiritual gospel" in modern literature: his mastery of the sources is unparalleled; but he does not seem

* P. 69. See C. H. Turner, *The Study of the New Testament*, for valuable suggestions on the Fourth Gospel. Dr. Turner does not accept the traditional view of authorship, but stresses the historical value of the Gospel.

to have contributed anything to the armoury of those who cannot accept the traditional view of its authorship. Certainly that is not his primary purpose, for the simple reason that the worth of a document depends upon its internal merits, whoever its writer may have been; and, as Dr. Gardner himself reminds us, if a great painting turns out to have been done by other than the famous artist, this means not " that we have one great painting less, but one great artist more." Yet there is a deep interest that is more than antiquarian in the fact (as I believe it to be) that the Fourth Gospel is the product of " the disciple whom Jesus loved "—the man who stood closer than any other to the inner shrine of the Master's heart. And there is still much to be said in favour of the primitive tradition of Catholic theology.

There is one point that we must face before proceeding with our study of the Gospel. The prologue at the outset presents us with one of the dominant problems. It introduces into the literature of primitive Christianity a method, if not a conception, that had never before been used. The Synoptists know nothing of it. They begin their Gospels with the literal history of the physical career of Jesus as a matter of course. But not so St. John. He ignores the Nativity, and instead presents us with a description in terms of current Greek philosophy of the eternal Word which never was not, rendering his account of the Incarnation in the simple phrase: " *And the Word was made flesh, and dwelt among us.*" It is easy to avoid the problem presented here by following Harnack in his rejection of the prologue as an integral part of the Gospel, but it seems more natural to agree with Dr. Sanday* in his contention that it is neither a casual preface nor a mere appendix, but a veritable keystone to the entire thought of the Gospel. It holds the germinal idea of the book; it is the well from which it draws the water of its life. But could this once fisherman of Galilee have written it ? Could he have risen to the sublimity of its spiritual conceptions ? Could he have gained the literary power manifested in it and sustained throughout the pages following ? Could he have grasped the essentials of the deep philosophy that underlies it ? Such questions are rained upon us. But Faith answers that spiritual vision comes only through communion with Christ: it is not a branch of æsthetics to be acquired by study ! Sense tells us that twenty, even ten, years is ample time in which even a fisherman might attain to some of the culture of a city in which he lived ! And John was young when our Lord was crucified, and very old when the Gospel was produced. (For all its brilliance, Dr. Charles's argument in his great Com-

* *Criticism of the Fourth Gospel*, p. 200 *ff.*

mentary on the Apocalypse fails to establish the theory "that John the Apostle was never in Asia Minor, and that he died a martyr's death between the visit of St. Paul to the 'pillar' Apostles in Jerusalem, *circ.* A.D. 64 (?) and 70.")*

But is the doctrine of the *Logos* as it appears in the Fourth Gospel the result of a careful philosophic training on the part of the writer? Or is it simply the attempt of a keen, practical, but philosophically untrained mind to use a current conception for the furtherance of its great purpose? Surely we are driven to the latter conclusion. The Gospel is primarily a *missionary tract.* Its supreme aim, to which all else is subordinated, is to present Christ in a manner that will appeal to his hearers on their own familiar ground. And hence the writer, with his obviously deep insight into human nature, seizes upon the current phraseology of their philosophy as the medium of that presentation. So the prologue, in spite of apparent "metaphysical abstractions," has a very definite evangelistic purpose. It is a carefully constructed argument intended to grip the attention of the intellectual leaders of Ephesus, and to convince them that the Christian conception of the "Word" is really a higher stage in the development of their own "Logos." (Already St. Paul had made use of the same principle in his identification of "the unknown God" with the Christian Deity.) And apart from this primary aim there is the secondary purpose of strengthening the Ephesian Christians by enabling them to grapple with their intellectual environment. To the Hebrew convert it would be a valuable apologetic weapon; to the Greek it would follow as the logical restatement of his own philosophy of God! No zealous advocate of *any* cause, much less the messenger of the one Gospel, could afford to miss so great an opportunity as that which lay before the fourth Evangelist. For this a high standard of scholastic training was not essential, but only an alert mind—an intellect capable of assimilating the fringe of its environment. And it is but a truism to repeat that the writer's long familiarity with the life of the city would be more than enough to afford him a general knowledge of the religious thought of its inhabitants. This would be especially true in the case of one determined to achieve that purpose as a step towards the attainment of the end for which he lived. Moreover, the term "word" was probably already familiar to him as the "*Memra*" of the Targums (then current in oral form),† and he could scarcely fail to recognize its counterpart in the Ephesian

* Introduction, p. l. See Gardner, *Ephesian Gospel,* p. 72. *Cp.* Archbishop Bernard, *Studia Sacra,* p. 260 *ff.*

† See J. S. Johnston, *Philosophy of the Fourth Gospel,* p. 70 *ff.* A valuable little book.

"*Logos*." And this, with unerring judgment, he made not only the introduction, but the whole spiritual undertone of his message. It is God, the eternal pre-existent Word, in Christ manifesting Himself in the hearts of men. St. John showed a wonderful discriminating skill in omitting what was foreign to the thought of his readers; but he knew the environment into which his work was to be launched, and he had a shrewd idea of the meaning implied in the nineteenth-century doctrine of "the survival of the fittest." The Evangelist could not have written a treatise on the "Doctrine of the Logos from Heraclitus to Philo," but he yearned for souls and magnified the opportunity for the attainment of his end!

The Fourth Gospel particularly lends itself to this simplest of interpretations—one presenting *Christ in Us* as the ideal of the spiritual life. It is in this light that the present writer would seek to follow him.

* * * * *

The "Word" of St. John is not so much the "Jesus of history" as the exalted Lord of Christian experience. Had Calvary been the end, the Synoptics might, to that point, exist alone, unchanged, the completed record of all that could be known of the Lord. For they record the impressive events of His earthly career as they occurred in the light of common observation; they are impressionistic only as current events are to uncritical minds; they in no wise colour the existing facts as these appeared to men. But with St. John it is otherwise. His presentation of the exalted Christ—the Christ of experience, the Christ who is with us "even unto the end of the world," and after—must be as different from the Synoptic portrait as is a Tissot from a photographic print. It is essentially interpretative, and in so being it as distinctly lays bare the author's mind as it presents his ideal. There is no irreverence in the assertion that the Gospel is a revelation of the writer's inner life, but the contrary—far! The Lord risen and triumphant; the Lord inspiring the Church with His perpetual Presence; the Lord known as only He can be known to modern men is the Lord of St. John. There we see Him not in mere historic outline, the centre of a record of observed facts, but in the fulness of His Glory as He is revealed in a heart possessed by Him. The Gospel has thus become the outpouring of a soul whose content is the Holy Spirit of God. The Synoptists relate the remembered events of yesterday; our Evangelist reveals a present overpowering fact. His recollections of history are illumined by the immediate presence of *the Light!*

If history is only the listing of events in their own light as they occurred, then this is not history. But if history links

up cause and effect; if history reviews the gathered facts in the light of new discovery; if it strives to sound the psychic depths of great happenings—then this is history such as never has been written. For it unites the attributes most essential to the historian with an obviously unique first-hand knowledge of the facts! Modern criticism has invalidated not a whit the classic arguments of Westcott,* which satisfactorily demonstrate that the author of the book was an eye-witness of its happenings. (One cannot read even so moderate a book as Dr. Gardner's *Ephesian Gospel* without feeling that his criticism here is purely arbitrary, and that he has not squarely faced the opposite side.) I do not assume that the Gospel is an exact chronological "life" of our Lord, nor that it is free from serious historical defects, *but that it is true to its purpose in portraying Jesus as He is, and therefore was, during His earthly ministry.* St. John, as a product of an unscientific age, naturally lacked the critical apparatus of the modern scholar; but as acute historical discernment is chiefly needful in the task of sifting out the facts from a conglomerate mass of legend, tradition, falsehood, etc., it is hardly required of one who has experienced the events of which he writes. The sexton of a church bombed in Paris is fully capable of describing the affair as it happened. But a century hence a considerable degree of critical acumen will be demanded of one who would seek to reconstruct the event from the varying accounts that may be found in old letters, newspapers, biographies, and so forth. And the wise critic will give the greatest weight to the evidence of such persons as the old sexton; and should he be—as the true historian must ever be—something of a natural psychologist, he will be quick to sense in the narrative the effects of shock! No living witness is ever an automaton making exact, soulless phonographic records of life. We are even learning not to expect such mechanical exactitude of the hypothetical "Q."

From a believing point of view the Johannine portrayal of our Lord cannot be considered as less trustworthy than the Synoptic accounts. Because, while they undoubtedly give a more exact idea of Jesus as He appeared to men, while they relate events with little or no conscious attempts at interpretation (the disciples could not have understood all that they report), the Johannine Lord is truly the Christ of Christian experience. So might we account for the fact that this Gospel is the favourite devotional study of the saint. In its pages there stands revealed to him the companion of his life—the Christ who is mirrored in his soul. This is again borne out by the fact that St. Mark, the gospel of action, makes the strongest appeal

* Introduction to *Commentary on St. John's Gospel.*

to children whose spiritual vision is just awakening. They admire, and wonder, and trust Jesus as did the disciples before the shock of Calvary; they have not yet been gripped by the Glory of the Risen and Ascended Lord, nor been fully possessed by the power of the Paraclete. The material has not yet yielded to the mystical.

In Christian experience, as we know it from the writings of our "saints" and in common life, there is always a tinge of *mysticism*, a sense of something that reason cannot fathom, but which is yet the great reality. And in this sense St. John is a true mystic. He gives unconscious expression to that which falls beyond the experience of the average life, but which is the keynote of his thought. His environment is above—the Communion of Saints the natural condition of existence! That is the key, of course, to all mystical writings. It explains the strong undercurrent of kinship that we at once recognize between the Gospel and the *De Imitatione*—a kinship of souls attune to the same key, whose analysis of life has yielded the same precipitate. St. John and à Kempis are identical in spirit. The difference —which sometimes alienates the modern mind from the Imitation—is one of environment, the strictures which it perforce imposes upon the verbal and intellectual expression of spiritual processes. Fundamentally I doubt if there is any vital difference between the Christologies of St. John, à Kempis, and, say, a Father Stanton. At widely separated periods of mundane history, they are yet one in their communion with the Eternal; and in none is there departure from the historic Jesus of the first three Gospels. But one point I would again emphasize—no mystical conception of the Christ can possibly have the sharp outline and colourless body of the photograph. It glows with the living, ever-changing aspect of the great painting. It inevitably reveals the peculiar impress that communion with God stamps on the heart of the believer. No teacher of Christianity seeks to analyze the character of his Lord after the method of the critical student who sifts the documents that might bear upon the career of an Abelard; rather he presents a reality of whose immanence he is never unaware; he draws a picture that must ever expand with the widening horizons of his spiritual consciousness. But it is *the same Christ* who first speaks to the awakening conscience of the child, who walked the plains of Palestine, who stands revealed in the mystic pages of St. John, who immortalized the spiritual musing of à Kempis! The point is admirably summarized by Professor E. F. Scott:

"In the historical figure of Jesus he seeks to adumbrate the eternal Christ, who is still present with His people, sharing their warfare, revealing Himself under ever-changing aspects. The Gospel is so composed that the

earlier time and the later are always merging in one another. Jesus speaks in His earthly life as He is speaking now in the consciousness of the Christian Church."*

The time series does not exist for the saint. But this is *history*, not antiquarianism—" true history, the history which still controls the rhythm of our hearts and circulates in our veins, inspiring us to new hope and new creation."

The Johannine conception of the exalted Christ is thus purely mystical in the best sense of the term. There is none of that " unbridled and capricious mysticism " which has completely divorced the glorified Lord from the historic character of the Synoptic Gospels. It was the sentimental, and therefore unspiritual, emotionalism of German pietism that aroused the animosity of Ritschl, and led him to give the quietus to a false mysticism which as completely ignored the reality of the Gospel Jesus as do the modern espousers of mythical theories. Ritschlianism, while perhaps a reaction to the opposite pole, corrected—let us hope for ever—the dangerous trend that nineteenth-century mysticism was taking. Ritschl himself was narrow in his ideal of personal religion. He seemed almost to have restricted God's power of revelation to the strictly orthodox; for with him " state-churchism " was a consuming fire that literally dominates his theological point of view. But his vehement, almost merciless opposition to (what he believed to be) wrong beliefs played a highly corrective part in the foundations of our modern theology. The world will remember Ritschl if it is only because he has enabled it to forget the religious immoralists of his day! A Labadie, a Jung Stilling, or a Lampe, are intolerable to an age which has read *The History of Pietism*.† In this connection Professor H. R. Mackintosh has a passage I would make my own. He writes:

" Ritschl poured a heavy fire upon the religious *illuminati* in every age who, arrogating the right to unmediated fellowship with Christ, have shown a marked disposition to regard the historic narrative of His life as but ' milk for babes.' . . . Speculation from an opposed yet kindred point of view has endeavoured to supersede the facts of history by the idea of a noumenal Christ or Christ principle, which should expand the narrow faith of the Church into a religion for humanity. The circumstances that the earthly life of Jesus was trammelled by restrictions of space and time, and only through death passed into a higher and boundless life, is transformed into the position that the truth present in Christianity is *per se* absolute and eternal, with a content grounded in reason, not on fact, and wholly independent of the fugitive and alogical elements of the time series. For the larger meanings of Jesus' work, accordingly, we must

* *The Fourth Gospel : Its Purpose and Theology*, p. 69.

† See Professor Robert Mackintosh's *Albrecht Ritschl and his School* for a sharp analysis of Ritschl's theology, and a fine chapter (viii.) on " The History of Pietism."

not look to the spirit unfolding truth in the Christian mind of successive generations, but to ' the speculative fancy, wandering at its own pleasure, and arriving from time to time at new beliefs.' Thus the exalted Christ vanishes in a mist of sentimentalism or dialectic. The living person is discarded, and instead we are offered a dream of passion or a lifeless philosophic principle. In exposing the untenability of such conceptions and their claim to rank as authentically Christian, Ritschl has done a peculiarly important service. He has effectually refuted the attempt to dissolve the person of Jesus in sub-personal factors—mystical or speculative—by pointing out that validly Christian views of Christ are distinguished by two marks: they predicate of the risen Lord those personal features which are present in the historic Saviour, and they insist on the fundamental obligation to obey His commandments. No conception of His Glory can be true which fails in either of these two ways."*

The view which the present writer would maintain does not seem to fail in either of these two ways. With the criticism of Dr. Mackintosh in view, the most striking difference between the Synoptics and the Fourth Gospel seems to be that the *sources* of the former were composed before the full glory of the ascended Lord had dawned upon the writers' thought, whereas in the latter we begin to see the larger meaning of Jesus and his work, " the spirit unfolding in the Christian mind." Clearly this exalted Christ could only be the work of time; and were He essentially a *different Christ* from that of the older Gospels, the inference is equally clear—the book is a product of a later age. But, as we have implied, it is perfectly demonstrable with no straining for effect that the highly spiritualized Christ of St. John is still the intensely human Jesus of St. Mark. There are few scholars to-day who would subscribe to the opinion of Réville which completely dehumanizes the Johannine Jesus. To say with him that Jesus never prays, or prays only to be heard, would demand a rather mutilating revision of the Gospel. We simply contend that John reproduces the *essential facts* in the light of his own intense spiritual intuition. He remembers the past as it occurred. He restates it interpreted by his own full vision of the exalted Lord. Hence the contrast, always so vivid, between the Synoptics and St. John is not one of kind, but only of degree. All draw upon the same historic undercurrent; the latter develops, but does not alter, the primary facts; the Jesus of the former, while more " historic," is none the less supernatural—a truth unaffected by the obvious fact that the writers of the triple record are seldom aware of the significance of what they write! Their perspective is naturally foreshortened. Bousset has said:

" Already the oldest Gospel is written from the standpoint of faith; already for Mark is Jesus not only the Messiah of the Jewish people, but

* *The Doctrine of the Person of Jesus Christ.*

the miraculous eternal Son of God, whose glory shone in this world. And it has been rightly emphasized that in this respect our first three Gospels are distinguished from the Fourth only in degree. . . . For the faith of the community, which the oldest Evangelist already shares, Jesus is the miraculous Son of God, in whom men believe, whom men put wholly on the side of God."*

With certain reservations it is easy to agree with the view enshrined in the above quotation, but the truth which Bousset stresses does not justify the opinion of J. Weiss that the " text of Mark has been very thoroughly revised from the Johannine standpoint, and a host of Johannine characteristics were inserted into it at some period subsequent to its use by Matthew and Luke."† Weiss's statement is evidently based on the somewhat doubtful hypothesis that the Fourth Gospel in some form is earlier than the final redaction of Mark. But how many scholars would now subscribe to that view? How many would rather admit that in the nature of the case there be no really decisive evidence in its support? Indeed, a purely critical accounting of the mass of data collected by Weiss might with reason ascribe it to the accepted view that both writers have been influenced by St. Paul.‡ But there is another manner of explaining these characteristics common to the two Gospels. Is it not enough to say that these traits are not Johannine, but rather result from the indelible impression made by Jesus—the " historic " Jesus—on the thought of the writers? To all Jesus is " the miraculous Son of God," the fact being realized with deeper insight by the beloved disciple. As we remarked in beginning, the scholar of to-day is often the victim of the nineteenth-century vice of isolating his problem from its historical context. He strives to create an intellectual vacuum as a workroom. In literary questions he frequently ignores the personal factor—a proceeding that is fatal in the study of so human a document as the Fourth Gospel. The ideal interpreter of St. John will be first of all a Christian mystic, a natural psychologist, and only secondarily a critic. The linguistic problems which often tax the ingenuity of the scholar might in many instances have a psychological explanation.

From the hypothesis of Pauline influence there is no escape! Nor should there be. St. Paul was undoubtedly the dominant figure in the Apostolic Church, and this, not because of higher intellectual attainments, but because of the strength and appeal of his almost unique personality. There would, indeed, be cause for amazement if this powerful influence had failed to

* Quoted by Professor H. R. Mackintosh from *Was wissen wir von Jesus*, pp. 54, 57.
† *Dic. Christ and the Gospels*, vol. ii., p. 324.
‡ See A. C. Headlam, *St. Paul and Christianity*, pp. ix-xiv, and chap. x.

leave its permanent impress on the theology of its day and after! But this does not mean that those others lacked originality and power; much less that the Fourth Gospel is, as Wernle would have it, a mere rehash of Pauline ideas.* Such a theory makes Paul master and John disciple, and, when pressed inexorably to its conclusion, credits the former with being the father of later Christianity. It appears to ignore the possibility of evolution in the faith, and this—not that St. Paul lacked Divine inspiration—because it strips of significance such utterances of Jesus as are peculiar to the last Gospel. What is of Paul and what of Jesus no reader might hope to know! But critics of the school of Wernle and Wrede fail to allow for the fact that St. Paul is unaware of this significance in his own theology. Not only so, but he expressly declares that he is preaching no unique religion, but simply the common belief of the whole Church (1 Cor. xv. 11). Indeed, throughout his Epistles he constantly assumes that the ground-plan of his preaching is familiar to all Christians alike. Were this not so, how long would he have escaped the censure of his colleagues in the Apostolate? Men who, like St. John, were eye-witnesses, who had living memories of all that Jesus said and did, who had consorted with the Risen Lord, were not likely to have subordinated everything to the will of the new Apostle. What is called "Paulinism" in the Gospel rests upon but one thing—*a common spiritual experience*. And however dominant intellectually, or in power of discipline, the Apostle to the Gentiles was yet singularly humble in the realm of faith. Whether he came "with the rod, or in love, and in the spirit of meekness" (1 Cor. iv. 21), it was always with an overwhelming sense that he was but the instrument of God. "Not I, but the Lord," is the constantly reiterated spirit of St. Paul. But here the critic must forget his tools and trust to the finer discernment of the mystic. For it is only in so far as we are practical "mystics"—seeking to discover our own Lord in experience—that we become really Christians. We must ourselves go to the records to learn the secret of our Lord's mastery of men. We may be immensely impressed, for instance, by the Pauline Christology; we may adopt it largely as our own; but there is a sense in which it will always be true to say that "every man has his own Christology."

In thinking of the Fourth Gospel as a "spiritual portrait," a more or less idealized study of Jesus, one is in danger of forgetting the fact that many of its events may be literally described as they occurred. Certainly, St. John has "spiritualized" some of the events as he sees them in the reflective light of old

* Inge, *Cambridge Biblical Essays*, p. 266. Wernle, *Beginnings of Christianity*, vol. ii, p. 262 *ff*.

age. With equal certainty others are pictured with the graphic vividness of one who has just looked upon them. They are burned into his mind. To the minutest detail they are as close to his thought as yesterday. One immediately thinks of dramatic scenes such as the cleansing of the Temple. But the passage that has impressed the present writer with a vividness above all others, that has gripped his imagination, that has stirred his heart and impelled him to utter with Thomas of old "*My Lord and my God*," is the description of the moral miracle of His conquest of the first disciples. In the whole of the Gospels there is no more remarkable scene than that which is described between the 29th and 50th verses of the first chapter of St. John.

This is one place where the Apostle recounts the facts without attempt at interpretation. There is no sense of distance about it, no suggestion that the description is impressionistic—that, though the events happened, they happened differently. If I may quote some words of my own:

"The writer is describing not the historical occurrence so much as its psychological effect. He may not exactly remember the conversation, but the absolute yielding of the Disciples to the call of Jesus has made its imperishable impression. He himself came under the sway of that unique personality. His whole life has been gripped by the Holy Spirit with increasing power as the years go by; and he sums up that experience (in a sense peculiarly his own) in these brief, vivid lines. It is a picture, not of Jesus as He *then* appeared, but as in personal experience His Spirit has possessed the Disciple's mind."

That is, of course, fairly true of the Gospel as a whole, and is in a measure the thesis of this essay; but I cannot conceive of it as true of this section of the first chapter. What is my argument? It is, perhaps, psychic. I find myself unable to read the passage without emotion. It grips. It gives the impression of a man rushing into my room and blurting out in halting, excited phrases his first account of an extraordinary experience. There is no art, no colour, no attempt at effect—simply the crude, bald assertion of something that has just taken place!

"And looking upon Jesus as he walked, he saith, 'Behold the Lamb of God'! And the two disciples heard him speak, and they followed Jesus. And Jesus turned, and saw them following, and said to them, 'What seek ye?' They said unto Him, 'Rabbi, where dwellest Thou?' He saith unto them, 'Come and see.' They came and saw where He dwelt, and abode with Him that day: for it was about the tenth hour."

And the wonder of it is that they followed Him. Just a look, just a word containing an *unreasonable* suggestion, and they are carried off their feet by the power of His divine personality! And so it is with Simon, and Philip, and Nathanael. They look, they listen, they are won. They do not

understand it. They have not learned the true identity of their "Messiah," but they are captivated by the charm or power of His person. St. John is one of them, and it may be that on his return home, while yet under the spell of this first experience of the One who was to love him best, he set down in the simple, hesitant phraseology of the unschooled the "memoir" that is here enshrined in his later Gospel. What could be more natural? It was the first meeting with One who began at once to be a dominant factor in his life. He might be expected to have committed it to writing; but even if he failed to do this, it would remain to the end an unforgettable experience that time could not dim. And it is an experience that gains in power by being set down as it occurred. The sense of freshness and literalness is only heightened by comparison with the more prosaic narrative of St. Mark. Mark is repeating a story; John is relating an experience.

It is because of that experience, developed and intensified in later life through constant meditation, that the Apostle is enabled to rise to the sublimity of the prologue. No philosopher with a theoretical Christology could have conceived the great thought of the Incarnate Word, "full of grace and truth," the life and the light of men, giving them "power to become the sons of God." Surely there is ground here for argument in favour of Apostolic authorship. The tendency of recent criticism seems to assume a point of contact between the author of the Gospel and our Lord;* but no younger disciple could have experienced the close companionship and harmony of mind with that of Jesus that was the lot of *this* disciple, and the fact remain unnoted in the records. No disciple who was not a participant in the actual scene described in this first chapter could possibly have written it!

This half-chapter, then, brings the whole Gospel into touch with life by supplying the key to the great meditation (for what is it but that?) which follows and which precedes it. When, at the bidding of the Baptist, he "beheld the Lamb of God," it was to become His slave. And it was in the glorious liberty of that slavery to the Source of all life and light that he painted this picture of the historic Christ as He may become to the heart that follows Him whithersoever He may lead. It is thus that we become "the sons of God." It is in "*Christ in us*" that we—

"*Behold the Lamb of God that taketh away the sin of the world.*"

PORT ARTHUR, ONT.,
March 10, 1923.

ERIC MONTIZAMBERT.

* *E.g.*, Stanton, Ed. Meyer, Dr. Burney, quoted in Gore's *Belief in Christ*, p. 107 *ff.*

QUESTIONS ON THE EUCHARIST*

Canon Storr's lecture, reprinted in pamphlet form, deserves consideration as a serious and courteous challenge to Catholics to state their position and faith in regard to the Blessed Sacrament. It might seem strange that such a request should be necessary, seeing the large number of books, pamphlets, and articles on the subject. Yet it cannot be denied that the challenge is in one sense justifiable; for the reader of all these works would undoubtedly find that at the end of reading the whole of them (if anyone could be found with the heroic fortitude to undertake the task), he had perused a large number of writings, which agreed as to the desirability of certain forms of devotional practice, but were very far from putting forward a common dogmatic basis. Lest at this point the familiar Roman controversial argument should be put forward, that Catholics of the Anglican obedience do not agree in what they teach, it may be added that if the heroic reader went on to peruse an equal number of Roman Catholic writings, he would find the same phenomenon, except that they all agreed in using the word Transubstantiation as a name to cover the doctrines they advocated.

The difference, indeed, is not one that discredits Catholics; it only means that there are various ways by which the mind of the individual approaches a mystery which is not exhausted by any one line of explanation. Canon Storr objects to the use of the defence of Catholic doctrine on the ground that it is a mystery which we cannot explain, and his objection is justified where the defence is used to cover a complete refusal to attempt to give any rational explanation of a particular doctrine. He would not, I think, deny that it is justifiable to use it to explain the impossibility of putting forward any single explanation which will be entirely exhaustive. After all, we have in the last resort to admit that the doctrines of the Holy Trinity and the Incarnation are " mysteries " in the sense that no explanation of them can ever hope to be final and complete. More particularly the presence of various explanations is inevitable in the present state of the Catholic movement in the Church of England. For although that movement is sometimes represented as highly organized and disciplined, it is notorious that it is, in fact, nothing of the kind. It is a movement, in the true sense of the word, proceeding from a widespread desire to recover the life of Catholic devotion; and, like all genuine move-

* *A Crisis in the Church.* By Canon V. F. Storr, M.A. Oxford: Basil Blackwell. 3d.

ments, it includes a vast variety of people, who differ considerably both in their unconscious desires and in their explicit theological positions. The divergence is evidence of the spontaneity and genuineness of the movement, and it is most marked among the laity, who, in spite of Canon Storr's statement that the movement is a clerical one, are mainly responsible both for the growth of the movement in numbers and for its more " extreme " developments.

It is sometimes urged that the Catholic conception of the Blessed Sacrament involves the attribution of spiritual properties to mere matter. Canon Storr is too good a theologian not to recognize that the material is often a vehicle of divine revelation. But he proceeds to argue that the revelation of God through the material is a lower form of revelation than the purely spiritual. Here, again, no Catholic has any objection to make. " When He shall appear, we shall be like Him; for we shall see Him as He is." In heaven, no doubt, we shall see God face to face, if we may use a conventional metaphor for that eternal union with God in heaven which is the portion of the blessed. But the question is what the relation of the spiritual to the material ought to be in the present life, and here we can hardly imagine that any Evangelical would deny that the Christian while he is in this life ought normally to be a regular communicant; he would hardly hold the perilous view that the Christian can ever hold himself to have developed so far that he can say, " Sacraments are no longer suitable for one who has reached my stage of spiritual development." And so long as the service of Holy Communion forms a part of our spiritual lives, so long do we admit that in some sense we have need of the material as a means of spiritual grace.

It is from this point of view that we may begin to consider the Blessed Sacrament. For the Christian the distinction between material and spiritual can never be one that is absolute and final. All the material universe is a revelation of spirit. Sometimes, as in a beautiful sunset, it is a revelation of God. Sometimes, as, let us say, in St. Paul's Cathedral, it is a revelation of God working through the mind of man. Sometimes it is a revelation of man apart from God; there are very few material objects between St. Paul's Cathedral and Epping Forest which are not a revelation of man apart from God (it would involve theological speculations which are not, perhaps, relevant to our present subject to inquire whether they are not revelations of the devil). Further, this element of the material cannot be confined to objects in the common sense, such as churches, houses, and pictures. The normal means of communication between human beings are material. This is obvious in the

case of those collections of hieroglyphics, usually black scratches on white paper, which we call books (one of them we call the Bible) or letters. It is equally true of the spoken word, a material vibration of the atmosphere, or of music, which is a series of vibrations of the atmosphere which are not even articulated into words. All these are material things, which can be the means of communication between spiritual beings. but are not necessarily so. If a Chinaman talks to me in Chinese, I am conscious of the material vibrations of the atmosphere in the form of sound, but there is no spiritual communication between us. A Hottentot can derive no spiritual benefit from the Bible if he cannot read it. It may be a damaging admission to make, but it is a sheer matter of fact that music has for me no meaning whatsoever; it is merely a series of noises. But I have never felt that this would justify me in denying that music has a spiritual value for those who are able to understand it.

Thus, if we exclude the highly unproved assertions as to the possibility of telepathy, we have to admit that material means are necessary for communication between human beings. The same is not true entirely of communication between man and God. But it is true to a far greater extent than is usually allowed. For in our spiritual life we depend to a considerable extent upon formulated words, and again on mental pictures, counterparts of material things constructed by the imagination largely out of memories of things we have seen and heard in the past. Even if we consider the type of prayer which consists of pure acts of the will, those acts of the will normally depend for their efficacy at first on our power, not merely to produce the mental disposition—for instance, of sorrow for sin—but also the bodily sensation which accompanies violent sorrow. Of course, this is only true of the initial stages of such a form of prayer; but to pass beyond these stages implies a considerable progress in the mystical life. Till we have passed beyond it, we have no right to speak as if we had attained to purely spiritual communion with God. And those who have reached these higher stages of the spiritual life are usually remarkable for their love of the Sacraments.

Now, the various means of the revelation of God through material things are all insignificant as compared with His supreme revelation of Himself in the Incarnation. In the Incarnation God reveals Himself as man in a form which man can both understand and love. The Incarnation was necessarily an event localized in time and space, for it had to be a genuine event in human history if our Lord was to possess a genuine humanity; a permanent incarnate life of Jesus on earth would

obviously imply a purely docetic humanity. Yet, on any showing, the benefits of the Incarnation are available for all generations of mankind, not only for those that have followed it, but for those that went before it. Unless we admit this, we must either admit that no one was saved before the Incarnation (and one could hardly worship and certainly not love a Creator who was guilty of creating countless generations to be damned inevitably), or that their salvation was independent of the Incarnation and the Atonement, which it is obvious that no Christian can for one moment allow.

Now, from the ordinary point of view of human language, we are bound to say that the generations that passed before the Incarnation were saved by the foreseen merits of the atoning life and death of our Lord. Then we distinguish a period of some thirty years when God was Incarnate, and lived and died among men; and we go on to a further period when He is no longer Incarnate on earth, but exists in heaven, both as God and as glorified man. This is, of course, the whole theme of the Epistle to the Hebrews. It is a necessary method of human thought. But it has always seemed to be profoundly unsatisfactory, if we allow ourselves to forget for a moment that it is merely a convenient and necessary method of looking at a truth which finally transcends human understanding. For it implies that the category of time applies to God Himself, and that in the process of time the second person of the Holy Trinity changed from being pure God to being God made man, and later to being God in a glorified humanity. And it has a further drawback. For it implies that the crucified humanity of Calvary is somehow different from, and inferior to, the glorified humanity of Jesus in heaven. This conception is certainly not that of the Fourth Gospel, which makes the culmination of the glory of Jesus the Cross, the interpretation of the glory of God in terms of this world. It misses the profundity of the vision of the Apocalypse, which sees our Lord as the Lamb slain from the foundation of the world. (*Cf.* Charles's note on the passage.) From this point of view, the truth would seem to be the eternal will of God to become Incarnate and to die for man, a fact expressed in time and space, because it could not be expressed otherwise as a genuine human event, but in itself outside the order of time. Canon Storr appears to have heard of this line of argument, since he asks what evidence there is for the view that our Lord had already made some sacrifice of Himself in heaven, and gave His disciples at the Last Supper His sacrificial life. This seems rather a curious way of dismissing an argument; it is not a question of evidence, but of whether it is consistent with human sanity to believe that God Himself is entirely within the order

of time, as the conventional theology presupposes, and whether we are not bound to believe that the essence of Calvary is the willingness of God the Son to be made man and to die within the order of time.

None the less, it is necessary from the ordinary human point of view to treat the Incarnation as a human event, and to relate the Blessed Sacrament to the Incarnation regarded as an event in the time-order. We have seen that the Incarnation is the supreme instance of the revelation of God to man through the means of material things, for it is the revelation of God in the nature of man. With the crowning act of this revelation, the death of Jesus on the Cross, the Eucharist is intimately associated; the controversy turns on the question of the closeness of association—in other words, on the meaning of our Lord when He said, "This is My body." Here Canon Storr argues that the words, as used in the upper room, must necessarily have had the same meaning on the night of the Last Supper as they have now; since they could not have meant, "This is My physical body" (for that body was present at the moment), nor "This is My heavenly body" (for Jesus had not yet ascended, and His heavenly body did not exist); therefore, they can only mean, "This is a symbol of My body," as we might say, "This is St. Paul's," of a picture of the cathedral no less than of the cathedral itself.

Now, the assumption in Canon Storr's argument is that the words of institution at the Last Supper must have had precisely the same meaning as they do at a celebration, except in so far as the subsequent experience of Christians has deepened their meaning for us. It seems obvious at first sight that this ought to be so. But when we examine the words, we find at once that on any explanation the words are anticipatory. This comes out very clearly in the words which our Lord uses at the institution of the chalice: "This is My blood of the covenant, which is being shed for many." Now, these words are anticipatory in a double manner. In the first place, they substitute the Eucharist for the old ceremony of the Passover. And so clearly is this substitution realized by the devotion of the primitive Church, that it has caused St. Mark and his followers to transfer the Last Supper to the actual time of the Paschal meal, without regard to the violence done to all historical possibility by the idea of the Crucifixion happening on the actual day of the Passover. The Fourth Gospel, either because the writer had a better tradition than the Synoptists, or because he was better versed in Jewish practice, has realized this, and puts the Last Supper rightly a day earlier, so that it is the death of our Lord at the ninth hour, not the Last Supper, which

practically coincides with the slaying of the Paschal Lamb. The Last Supper is an anticipation of the Paschal meal, not the Passover itself. Further, there is another anticipation. Our Lord speaks of the blood which is being shed (*τὸ ἐκχυννόμενον*), when in point of fact our Lord's blood was not being shed at the moment. Thus, on any showing, if we press the words used in the institution of the cup, the Eucharist of the Last Supper is only fully intelligible if taken as the anticipation of the event of the following day, the death of Jesus on the Cross.

It is only from this point of view that we can find that equation of Calvary and the Eucharist which is postulated by all Christian thought, Evangelical as well as Catholic. Canon Storr will hardly deny that the Eucharist is a memorial of the Crucifixion. Yet how could the Last Supper be a memorial of the Crucifixion? You can hardly have a memorial of an event which is still in the future. The identity of the Eucharist with the Last Supper is only tenable if we hold that the Last Supper was identical with the Cross, in the sense that it was in point of time an anticipation, but in point of actual content identical, as the authoritative act of consecration by which our Lord declared that His death was to be the sacrifice of our redemption. In this sense the Last Supper is an integral part of the sacrifice of the Cross, as being the solemn setting apart of the victim, which is, on the analogy of other forms of sacrifice, a part of the rite, no less than the slaying of the victim. From this point of view, the act of communion is the means by which the believer is made a partaker in the sacrifice of the Cross which is the means of our redemption, and that sacrificed humanity which is our daily bread. It is the same rite as the Last Supper, because the Last Supper is itself an integral part of the Cross. On any other showing the Eucharist is something quite different from the Last Supper. For it is a memorial of the death of Christ, whereas the Last Supper preceded His death. Or is it only a memorial of the Last Supper? There seems no adequate reason for singling out the Last Supper for perpetual memorial by the Church, as against any other incident in the life of Jesus. Obviously, the only single event which deserves such special isolation is the death upon the Cross, which is the final summing-up of our Lord's earthly life of sacrifice, and the revelation in time of His eternal sacrifice in heaven. But if the Eucharist is a memorial of Calvary, it is so because the Last Supper from which it originates is itself a part of Calvary.

None the less, it may still be urged that the words, "This is My body," can quite naturally mean, "This is a symbol of My body," and that they ought to mean no more than this. But the question immediately arises, "What is a symbol?" As a

matter of fact, it is doubtful whether such a thing as a mere symbol can exist. It might seem that words and names are merely symbols, and nothing more, since they could at any moment be changed, as a man can change his name. Yet even here the name has a value, derived from the fact that it rests on some form of common consent or on a legal basis. If I want to change my name, I can only do so by a public process drawing attention to the fact that my recognized symbol is being changed; if I omit to do so, I incur considerable suspicion and involve myself in endless inconvenience. The symbol may be entirely meaningless; but the common consent on which it rests gives it a value of its own. In other cases a symbol of the most trifling intrinsic value may have a spiritual meaning of the utmost intensity. Thus, a national flag may be merely a yard of calico; but it is the focus for all sorts of spiritual emotions, such as national pride and loyalty, or the hatred of another nation. (Obviously, such emotions are spiritual, even if in some cases they are evil.) Moreover, such a symbol does not merely represent a sentiment already existing in the minds of those who use it; it may evoke loyalty where it has not existed, or focus and intensify emotions which would otherwise have been vague and ineffective. And it is a natural human instinct which leads us to offer external marks of respect to a national flag or the tune of a national anthem.

It will hardly be denied that the Eucharist, in whatever sense it is a symbol, falls into the latter class, in the sense that it represents the focus of certain spiritual dispositions which would not have existed, or would not have existed with the same intensity, without it. It is a symbol of the manhood of Jesus crucified and glorified, for the two are merely different ways of regarding the same fact. Now, seeing that in ordinary life we treat such symbols with outward marks of respect, as the focus or rallying point of certain emotions (as when we stand up because a band is playing "God save the King," and we recognize the National Anthem as the focus of the virtue of patriotism, though we know that it is also the last refuge of scoundrels), it is natural that we should treat the symbolic memorial of our divine Redeemer with even greater homage.

But, as a matter of fact, we cannot treat the Blessed Sacrament as a mere symbol; indeed, in the strict sense, we have ceased to treat it as a mere symbol when we recognize that it is a symbol which is also the focus of certain spiritual emotions. A name may be a mere symbol, but a flag is already something more. But a sacrament is more than the latter class of symbol. St. Paul attributes the sickness of some of the Corinthians and the death of others to their unworthy receiving of Holy

Communion. We may doubt the accuracy of his diagnosis, and attribute the fact rather to the psychological effect of a lively if superstitious faith combined with a guilty conscience; but there is no doubt that St. Paul considers the partaking of the Holy Communion as more than a mere symbol if he ascribes such effects to an unworthy communion. And in the official teaching of the Church of England the Sacraments are described not merely as signs, but as effectual signs, whereby God works invisibly in us. We may note in passing that Canon Storr, in his anxiety to emphasize the spiritual nature of the Blessed Sacrament by implication, denies the necessity of communion at all. Christ is present in the whole service, not merely after the prayer of consecration. "He is present not on the altar, but at the whole service; not in the bread, but in our hearts." But, if so, why should it be necessary to communicate at all? Why should we not read the service through at home, or why should we even read it through, if we have Him with us anyhow? And what is the service required for such a presence? Is He spiritually present in the Roman Mass, the liturgies of the Eastern Church, the Prayer-Book service, and, again, the abbreviated service for the communion of the sick in the Prayer-Book? And how does this fit in with the view that Holy Communion is the same as the Last Supper? I do not wish to press the point for fear of seeming captious; my point is to show that, however much we may desire to emphasize the spiritual side of Holy Communion, we are bound to admit that in the material act of communion, even if we insist on the fact that it only forms part of the service, we have a means of access to our Lord, which, from the mere fact that He instituted it, must have some special value which differentiates it from other forms of prayer, and presumably gives it a higher value. It is easy to urge in the abstract that the highest form of worship should be purely spiritual. But Holy Communion is not purely spiritual, since it includes these material actions; and if we are really to hold the purely spiritual point of view, we can only conclude either that our Lord in the night in which He was betrayed instituted an inferior form of worship, or that He did not, in fact, institute the Blessed Sacrament. Either point of view can be held; but I am very sure that Canon Storr would not defend either.

So, then, on any interpretation of the formularies of the Church of England, the material act of communion is a means of grace by which we partake of the Body and Blood of Christ, provided that we receive it worthily. At some points Canon Storr seems to imply that the Catholic attitude overlooks the necessity of spiritual fitness; in point of fact, the only difference is that Catholics believe with St. Paul that an unworthy com-

munion is the gravest danger to the soul, and I am not quite sure that Canon Storr's conception really necessitates this. Given this fitness, we have in the act of communion a unique means of grace. If this is so, then when I am in the act of communion I must necessarily concentrate all my soul in an offering of gratitude, homage, and devotion to the Lord who has vouchsafed me so great a benefit. This offering may be present at other parts of the service, but it will be mingled with the expression of other forms of devotion, such as penitence and intercession. And when I am in the presence of the Reserved Sacrament, I am in the presence, so to speak, of the possibility of receiving Jesus in this unique method which He has instituted. And though, for one reason or another, I am not at the moment going to receive Him in Holy Communion, yet it is inevitable that I should at such a moment renew my homage as an act of thanksgiving for all the times I have ever received Him in communion, and of preparation for all those I hope to make. For I am at the moment in the presence of Jesus, in the sense that I am in the presence of the special channel of grace which He has ordained as the means through which He gives Himself to me in a form which, precisely because it is not purely spiritual, but both spiritual and material, is best adapted for my needs as long as I am not a purely spiritual being, who can afford to ignore the necessity of the material as an aid to the receiving of divine grace. If I were such a being, it would be unnecessary for me to go through the material act of communicating; and I do not think that Canon Storr would hold that the faithful Christian can ever hold that he has advanced so far in holiness that he can afford to dispense with Holy Communion. (We are not, of course, concerned with the special case of a Christian who, through no fault of his own, is cut off from the chance of communicating.) But as long as we agree that the material act of communicating is an indispensable part of the normal Christian life, it is a mere confusion of thought to describe the nature of Holy Communion as purely spiritual, or the presence of Jesus in the Sacrament as being a purely spiritual presence, since the material action is an essential part of it. No one is concerned to deny the necessity of devout preparation if we are to receive the benefit of Holy Communion; but unless we are prepared to say that devout prayer without the actual receiving of the Sacrament is as great a means of grace as the same energy of prayer with the act of communion added, we are bound to admit that the fact of communicating has a special value of its own as conveying Jesus to our souls in a manner which we should otherwise lack. And if He uses the outward forms of bread and wine as the means by which He bestows Himself on me, I can only

associate Him with them in a manner which justifies me in offering my homage to Him before the Reserved Sacrament in precisely the same manner as I offer it to Him at the moment of communion.

It may, indeed, be admitted that it is possible to conceive of a concentration of devotion on the Reserved Sacrament which would lead to a distorted conception of the Christian faith. But it is idle to talk of such devotion in general as tending to lead the faithful to forget the permanent presence of Christ in the soul of the Christian and in the whole Body of Christ. For these are exalted mystical ideas to which we must ascend by gradual stages. If we really had from the outset a perfect spiritual unity with our Lord, based on perfect love for Him, and expressing itself in perfect love for all our fellow-members of the Body of Christ, we should already be perfect, and it is conceivable that we should have no need of Sacraments. But it is impossible for us to attain to this level all at once, or, indeed, to attain to it at all in this life; for the greatest saints have always recognized themselves as the chief of sinners. Holy Communion is one of the means by which we learn the possibility of permanent union with Jesus, and that fellowship with other members of the Christian body which is represented in miniature by our fellow-communicants. It is, after all, only possible to acquire any virtue by performing acts of a virtuous character with the object of acquiring the virtue which as yet we possess only in an imperfect degree. We teach children to say "Thank you," not because they are grateful, but in order that they may learn the virtue of gratitude, or perhaps of courtesy. In the same way we acquire the realization of the permanent presence of Christ by the temporary realization of it in Holy Communion, and in an infinitely lesser degree by temporary devotions before the Reserved Sacrament.

Naturally, there may be a danger of our being content with the temporary sense of presence if we are never taught to go any further. But, in fact, this danger has never been proved to exist in practice. Warnings about it usually come from those who have never been accustomed to work in a parish where the Blessed Sacrament is reserved, or from those who fail to realize that in dealing with the outcasts of East London it is, perhaps, something to get them even to realize the presence of Jesus in the Blessed Sacrament, even if they never get much further in this life; one would have thought it better that they should touch but the hem of His garment, rather than remain utterly cut off from Him. Normally, careful teaching on other aspects of the Christian life is a sufficient remedy against any possible danger. It is possible that devotion to Jesus in Holy

Communion is not the absolute perfection of Christian devotion; or, rather, it is obvious, for the perfection of Christian devotion is to "see Him face to face in heaven." But in the present life it is, perhaps, as well to remember that it is only as little children that we can enter into the kingdom of God.

WILFRED L. KNOX.

A STUDY OF DR. JOHNSON'S RELIGION

THE pages of *Punch* have made familiar to us moderns the picture of John Bull, his outward semblance directly traceable to "Farmer George," the bluff eighteenth-century monarch, his character named and thus described by Arbuthnot, the eighteenth-century satirist: "An honest, plain-dealing fellow, choleric, bold, and of a very inconstant temper. He dreads not old Lewis." About the same time the same figure meets us in country-gentleman guise, portrayed by genius as Sir Roger de Coverley. A generation later we find in Grub Street a typical man of his age, a dweller in towns, a Londoner by adoption, a prejudiced despiser of Scotchmen, Frenchmen, Italians, political agitators, and Whigs, an intellectual giant. But it is the same man: Samuel Johnson.

The most indulgent and the most acute critics of eighteenth-century England alike describe the century as an age of material progress, and of indifference to the spiritual side of religion, an age of active philanthropy combined with excessive love of personal comfort. Yet this age also saw the Methodist revival; in this age lived William Blake, poet-painter-mystic; Macpherson's imposture and Chatterton's forgeries found in this age willing dupes. So in Samuel Johnson, son of his age, apostle of common sense, existed whimsical superstition on the surface, and deep below that sense of the supernatural which it was the fashion of his age to decry.

Let us trace the main features of Dr. Johnson's religious beliefs, trying to see to what extent he represented the ideas of his century, and the manner in which the seeds of much that we are accustomed to call Catholic were sown, watered, and increased in this son of the age of comfort and materialism. He tells us that from nine till eighteen years old he was inattentive or indifferent to religion. Reading Law's *Serious Call to a Holy Life* in a fit of dullness or levity, he found Law "quite an overmatch for him." As Dr. Johnson's youthful laxity did not arise from any reasoned questioning of religion,

so it was dispelled, not by laying intellectual foundations, but by instruction in positive piety. From this time forward, as he told Boswell, religion was the predominant object of his thoughts.

Since Johnson himself ascribes his first serious attention to a Christian life to Law's *Call*, it is well to note the points in which his practice and theories may have been derived from this book. It is probable that Johnson's vigorous mind might have evolved these practices and theories for himself. It is certain that the form they took was his own. And, again, it is likely that the ideas were "in the air," as we say, and possibly may not be directly traceable to Law.

First, then, Law defines "devotion" as a life given and devoted to God. "He, therefore, is the devout man who lives no longer to his own will, or the way and spirit of the world, but to the sole will of God; who considers God in everything, who serves God in everything, who makes all parts of his common life parts of piety, by doing everything in the name of God, and under such rules as are conformable to His glory." Hear Dr. Johnson on the matter: "All acknowledged what scarcely anybody practised, the obligations we were under of making the concerns of eternity the governing principles of our lives." Again: "I shall not speak of theology, because it ought not to be considered as a question whether you shall endeavour to know the will of God."

On the use of money Law says: "On all accounts it appears that it is absolutely necessary to make reason and religion the strict rule of using all our fortune." Again: "If we are to use anything as the gift of God, we are to use everything as His gift." Law extols the practice of Miranda. "Her fortune, therefore, is divided betwixt herself and several poor people, and she has only her part of relief from it. . . . Excepting her victuals, she never spent near ten pounds a year upon herself." Law advocates indiscriminate almsgiving. He and his pious friends were a great embarrassment to the Rector of King's Cliffe, whose remonstrances were vain. "It may be that I may often give to those that do not deserve it, or that will make an ill use of my alms. But what then? Is not this the very method of Divine goodness? Does not God make His sun to rise on the evil and on the good?"

The poor Johnson practised charity and almsgiving with a result of greater suffering and deprivation than the rich Miss Gibbon (Miranda's prototype) ever knew. Charity deprived her of luxuries; but her home life was dignified and harmonious. At a time when Johnson was *impransus*, he would put pennies into the hands of outcast children sleeping in the streets, so that when they woke they might find a breakfast. Johnson

proposed to allow himself £100 a year out of his pension of £300. His home life at Bolt Court has been described in a letter to Mrs. Thrale, which betrays a most uncomfortable state of affairs. There he harboured a heterogeneous quarrelling company, partially or wholly supported by him. From none of them, not even from his black servant Thomas Barber, did he expect or receive gratitude, or any known service. To Barber he had given education, and to him left most of his money.

Johnson refers us to Law's explanation of St. Paul's expression, "I am the chief of sinners": "Though you may know abundance of people to be guilty of some gross sins with which you cannot charge yourself, yet you may justly condemn yourself as the greatest sinner that you know. . . . Because you know more of the folly of your own heart than you do of other people's, and can charge yourself with various sins that you only know of yourself, and cannot be sure that other sinners are guilty of them. . . . The greatness of our guilt arises chiefly from the greatness of God's goodness towards us, from the particular graces and blessings, the favours, the lights and instructions, that we have received from Him." Now hear Johnson: "You may not have committed such crimes as some men have done; but you do not know against what degree of light they have sinned."

Law's mystical side was deprecated by Johnson: "Law fell latterly into the reveries of Jacob Behmen, whom Law alleged to have been somewhat in the same state with St. Paul, and to have seen unutterable things. Were it even so, Jacob would have resembled St. Paul still more by not attempting to utter them."

Johnson's appetite for reading is, of course, a byword, and we can estimate to some degree the extent of his theological reading by the number of quotations in Boswell, where hardly a page is without reference to divinity or philosophy. These quotations testify to Johnson's insatiable appetite and to his accurate memory. But they are rather like the food which Johnson ate, threw about as he ate, or spilled on his clothing. They are generally torn to pieces, or tossed about as illustrations to an argument; they do not seem to have become part of him. There are few theologians whose thought is venerated by Johnson, or whom he has taken as his masters. In the imaginary University sketched by Boswell, Johnson would trust no one but himself with logic, metaphysics, or scholastic divinity. It is clear that he felt himself to be a master in this department of learning. To Boswell's exhortation to write expressly in support of Christianity, he answered reverently: "I hope I shall." This hope was not fulfilled; Johnson has left no theological writings, and the greater part of his journal was burnt

by his wish. But it is possible to collect from his talk, his prayers, and extant writings some material for such a book.

First, then, as to Dogmatic Theology. Among the prominent clergy of the day was Dr. Clarke, a rationalistic divine, condemned by the Lower House of Convocation for a tendency to Arianism. Clarke's sermons were commended by Johnson to Boswell, but with an express warning against their Unitarian tendency. Many expressions in Johnson's *Meditations* and doxologies to his *Prayers* show his own positive belief in the Trinity. Johnson's belief in the Atonement took somewhat different form at different times in his life. Boswell says: "I spoke of the satisfaction of Christ. He said his notion was that it did not atone for the sins of the world; but, by satisfying divine justice, by showing that no less than the Son of God suffered for sin, it showed to men and innumerable created beings the heinousness of it." But this view was but a partial or temporary opinion. Johnson was convinced of the propitiatory sacrifice, and hence arose his admiration of Clarke's sermons, wherein much stress was laid on a somewhat mechanical theory of substitution. Some paragraphs dictated to Boswell in 1781 give his matured beliefs on sacrifice and propitiation. The first and last sentences embody the gist of the argument, which is too long to be quoted in full:

"Whatever difficulty there may be in the conception of vicarious punishments, it is an opinion which has had possession of mankind in all ages. There is no nation that has not used the practice of sacrifices. . . . The peculiar doctrine of Christianity is that of a universal sacrifice and perpetual propitiation. Other prophets only proclaimed the will and the threatenings of God. Christ satisfied His justice."

At this point Johnson's thoughts on death and eternity claim attention. For, clear as was his belief in the efficacy of our Lord's sacrifice, it was equally clear in the need of our obedience and repentance. His intense dissatisfaction with his own life made him often doubt, therefore, his own claim to forgiveness.

"You know," says he, "I never thought confidence with respect to futurity any part of the character of a brave, a wise, or a good man. Bravery has no place where it can avail nothing; wisdom impresses strongly the consciousness of those faults of which it is, perhaps, itself an aggravation; and goodness, always wishing to be better, and imputing every deficience to criminal negligence, and every fault to voluntary corruption, never dares to suppose the condition of forgiveness fulfilled, nor what is wanting in the crime supplied by penitence. This is the state of the best; but what must be the condition of him whose heart will not suffer him to rank himself among the best, or among the good? Such must be his dread of the approaching trial, as will leave him little attention to the opinion

of those whom he is leaving for ever; and the serenity that is not felt, it can be no virtue to feign."

Again, in a conversation with Dr. and Mrs. Adams: "As I cannot be *sure* that I have fulfilled the conditions on which salvation is granted, I am afraid I may be one of those who shall de damned." When taxed by Mrs. Adams with forgetting our Lord's merits, Johnson said: "Madam, I do not forget the merits of my Redeemer; but my Redeemer has said that He will set some on His right hand and some on His left."

"What do you think, sir, of Purgatory, as believed by the Roman Catholics?" said Boswell one day. Johnson: "Why, sir, it is a very harmless doctrine. They are of opinion that the generality of mankind are neither so obstinately wicked as to deserve everlasting punishment, nor so good as to merit being admitted into the society of blessed spirits, and, therefore, that God is graciously pleased to allow of a middle state where they may be purified by certain degrees of suffering. . . ." "There is no harm in believing it," he said on another occasion, "but you must not compel others to make it an article of faith, for it is not revealed."

At another time he said: "I do not imagine that all things will be made clear to us immediately after death, but that the ways of Providence will be explained to us very gradually." He assented to Dr. Brown's image of different degrees of future happiness: "A great and a small glass, though equally full, do not hold an equal quantity." Speaking of heaven he said: "In *this* state of being there are many pleasures and vices. The happiness of heaven will be, that pleasure and virtue will be perfectly consistent."

Johnson saw the difficulty of reconciling God's foreknowledge with man's freewill. He says:

> "You are surer that you are free than you are of prescience; you are surer that you can lift up your finger or not as you please than you are of any conclusion from a deduction of reasoning. But let us consider a little the objection from prescience. It is certain I am either to go home to-night or not; that does not prevent my freedom. . . . If I am well acquainted with a man, I can judge with great probability how he will act in any case, without his being restrained by my judging. God may have this probability increased to certainty." Boswell: "When it is increased to certainty, freedom ceases." Johnson: "All theory is against the freedom of the will; all experience for it."

As a rule, Johnson poked heavy and undiscerning fun at the idealists. But one of his quips is worth noting. On one occasion, as a disciple of Berkeley was taking his leave, "Pray, sir, don't leave us," said Johnson, "for we may perhaps forget to think of you, and then you will cease to exist."

Johnson was born in a cathedral city, nurtured by his Tory bookseller father, and by a mother whose belief in Divine Right was proved by having her scrofulous child touched by Queen Anne for the King's evil. His education at grammar school and at Oxford, and his conversion by the writings of William Law, non-juror and High Churchman, all made it natural that the early bent of Johnson's mind should be High Church. Later, his vast reading confirmed him in this bent, and his taste was always for sobriety and restraint in expression. But he had no belief in the innate superiority of the Anglican over the Roman or the Eastern Orthodox Churches. To his mind the differences between them were mainly national and political.

"All denominations of Christians have little difference in point of doctrine, though they may differ widely in external forms. There is a prodigious difference between the external form of one of your Presbyterian churches in Scotland and a church in Italy; yet the doctrine taught is essentially the same."

He excused subscription to the Thirty-nine Articles by undergraduates, who did not understand them, by saying that "Universities were founded to bring up members of the Church of England," and that "if you should ask them (undergraduates) in what it differs from the Presbyterian Church? from the Romish Church? from the Greek Church? from the Coptic Church? they could not tell you. So, sir, it comes to the same thing."

Politically, Johnson was in favour of the separation from Rome, but he had a respect for "the old religion." The doctor having expressed his belief that Purgatory was a reasonable doctrine, and prayers and Masses for the dead a logical outcome of it, Boswell asked him one day about "the idolatry of the Mass."

Johnson: "Sir, there is no idolatry in the Mass. They believe God to be there; and they adore Him." Boswell: "The worship of Saints?" Johnson: "Sir, they do not worship Saints; they invoke them; they only ask their prayers. I am talking all this time of the *doctrines* of the Church of Rome. I grant that in *practice* Purgatory is made a lucrative imposition, and that the people do become idolatrous as they recommend themselves to the tutelary protection of particular saints." . . . Boswell: "Confession?" Johnson: "Why, I don't know, but that is a good thing. The Scripture says, 'Confess your faults one to another,' and the priests confess as well as the laity. Then it must be considered that their absolution is only upon repentance, and often upon penance also. *You* think *your* sins may be forgiven without penance, upon absolution alone."

At this time Johnson pronounced the denial of the cup to the laity as "criminal." "I wonder," said he, "how the Council of Trent admitted it." At another time he apologized for the denial. Whatever Johnson's own leanings may have been towards Catholicism—and that they were considerable seems

certain, an intimate friend believing him always to have been a Roman Catholic—he was strongly convinced that it was wrong for any man to change the form of his faith without serious cause. For this and other causes he held it a point of principle to condemn Dissent, and in Scotland to refuse to attend a Presbyterian service. But he would read Presbyterian theology, though he had small respect for it. However, one of the few theologians to whom he acknowledged a debt was Baxter, of whose works he said to Boswell: "Read any of them; they are all good."

Johnson's taste in sermons was for the established and the reasoned rather than for the novel and the emotional. But he professed always great respect for the parts and the fervour of John Wesley. "Whatever could be thought of some Methodist teachers," he said, "he could hardly doubt the sincerity of that man who travelled nine hundred miles in a month and preached twelve times a week." He thought that the Methodists produced more effect on their hearers than the ordinary clergy of the day, because they took pains to talk simply and to suit their discourse to the common people. And indirectly he condemns the frigidity of eighteenth-century divines, when he says, talking of convicts: "Sir, one of our regular clergy will probably not impress their minds sufficiently: they should be attended by a Methodist preacher or a Popish priest."

In none of the material which has come down to us is there evidence that Johnson gave money to missions or to charity schools. But he did not keep accounts; and some of his many benefactions may have been to these objects. In a letter to Mr. Drummond, who had told him that some of the members of the S.P.C.K. had opposed a scheme for translating the Bible into Gaelic, Johnson says: "I did not expect to hear that it could be, in an assembly convened for the propagation of Christian knowledge, a question whether any nation uninstructed in religion should receive instruction. . . . To obscure, upon motives purely political, the light of revelation is a practice reserved for the reformed; and surely the blackest midnight of popery is meridian sunshine to such a reformation."

Dr. Johnson had a moderate sympathy for the need of temporary or permanent religious retirement. He had once thought of it for himself; but he had been assured that his vocation was to active life. When in France he stayed with the Benedictines, and always spoke well of them. But he seems to have missed the whole purpose of the contemplative orders, and to have thought of the Religious Life as a crutch for the feeble-minded, or a remedy against melancholy, or an asylum for the senile. He said: "If convents should be allowed at all, they should only be retreats for persons unable to serve the public,

or who have served it. It is our first duty to serve society; and after we have done that, we may attend wholly to the salvation of our own souls. A youthful passion for abstracted devotion should not be encouraged."

Among the points of religious observance by which Johnson set great store were the keeping of fasts and festivals. But he was careful to impress on his disciple that local observance and local devotion must not be raised to a position of the first importance, to the neglect of the duties of charity. Boswell had been so much impressed by Easter Day in St. Paul's Cathedral in 1773, that he writes to ask Johnson whether he shall come as a pilgrim from Scotland the following year. His own inclination is that way, but he is in debt; and Mrs. Boswell is near her confinement. Johnson answers: "Pleasure which must be enjoyed at the expense of another's pain can never be such as a worthy mind can wholly delight in." He goes on to discuss "the obligation of worshipping once a year in a certain place in imitation of the Jews," and decides: "If the annual resort to Jerusalem was a duty to the Jews, it was a duty because it was commanded; and you have no such command, therefore no such duty." Continuing his argument, Johnson says that it would be difficult to decide to what degree fancy is to be admitted into matters of religion, and that he would be far from wishing wholly to exclude it, since fancy is a gift of God, and, like all His gifts, should be used to His glory. Still, though all our faculties should co-operate in His worship, they should do so in their right order. As ceremonies are less than commands, as bodily adoration is but a symbol of mental adoration, so Fancy must always act in subordination to Reason. His advice ends nobly:

> "When we enter a church we habitually recall to mind the duty of adoration, but we must not omit adoration for want of a temple; because we know, and ought to remember, that the Universal Lord is everywhere present, and that, therefore, to come to Iona or to Jerusalem, though it may be useful, cannot be necessary."

Johnson was much interested in ghost stories, and in the tales of second sight which he heard in the Hebrides. His reply to Boswell's observation, that such manifestations might happen by chance, was: "They have happened so often that mankind have agreed to think them not fortuitous." In *Rasselas* a paragraph of close reasoning gives Johnson's clear opinion that apparitions of the dead are seen. Moreover, Johnson himself was once clair-audient. "One day at Oxford, as he was turning the key of his chamber, he heard his mother distinctly call: 'Sam!' She was then at Lichfield; but nothing ensued."

Again, he believed that the Divine Will was sometimes made known in dreams, and that evil dispositions might early be checked and bad tendencies discovered by means of dreams. He said to Mrs. Thrale: "Make your boy tell you his dreams: the first corruption that entered into my heart was communicated in a dream."

Johnson was not sceptical as to divine guidance or as to the reality of the "Inner Light" which some Methodists claimed. But he held reserve on such matters to be decent, and the encouragement in oneself of a belief in guidance, unless approved by reason, to be dangerous. "There is a middle state of mind between conviction and hypocrisy," said he, "of which many are unconscious. By trusting to impressions, a man may gradually come to yield to them, and at length be subject to them, so as not to be a free agent, or what is the same thing in effect, to *suppose* that he is not a free agent." Again: "If a man pretends to a principle of action of which I can know nothing—nay, not so much as that he has it, but only that he pretends to it—how can I tell what that person may be prompted to do? When a person professes to be governed by a written ascertained law, I can then know where to find him."

This study of Johnson's religion may fitly end with a summary of his practice. At eighteen he went to Pembroke College, Oxford. There is no record of Johnson's Confirmation, but the University authorities would doubtless enquire into the Confirmation of Freshmen. What were the religious obligations, and what the opportunities of a youth at Oxford in Johnson's day? Potter, one of the very few Whig High Churchmen, was Bishop. His charges gird at the laxity in his diocese.

The present chapel at Pembroke College was built in 1752. Therefore, during the whole of Johnson's residence the college services were held in St. Aldate's Church, hard by the college gate. Here the college Chaplain would say matins and evensong daily for the members of the college. Sunday services would resemble those of weekdays, and would be supplemented by the University sermon. Every undergraduate was compelled to attend a minimum number of college services every week—at this date probably four or five morning and evening. In the second year of Johnson's residence, Charles Wesley started at Christ Church that society which was to be the germ of Methodism. But the movement had little influence till John Wesley came back to Oxford as Fellow of Lincoln, and by that time Johnson had gone down. A little later on Whitfield tells us that the Methodists communicated more frequently than other undergraduates by receiving once a month at a parish church. This proves definitely that opportunities for reception were less

frequent in colleges. Probably the Chaplains did not celebrate more than three times a year in Johnson's day. We know that later in life he communicated once a year only, and that later still he resolved to receive three times a year.

We are on more certain ground as to Johnson's practice when over fifty, well established in London, he had become intimate with Boswell. He had a sitting at St. Clement Dane's, and attended St. Paul's Cathedral at Easter. Johnson had a rule of meditation for Sunday, "to brush off the soil of the week." His diary is full of notes as to the necessity for due preparation for, and reverent reception of, the Sacrament. It seems quite clear, however, from many expressions of Johnson's, and especially from his *Prayers*, that he had no belief in the Real Presence, but that he thought of the Holy Sacrifice as a mere, though very solemn, commemoration. He does not seem to have received fasting. The doctor fasted strictly in Holy Week, especially on Good Friday. Good Friday was passed in prayer, meditation, and church-going. Similarly, he spent each anniversary of his wife's death praying for her soul, and asking her prayers "conditionally." From time to time he spent a day in fasting, meditation, and humiliation.

Johnson's humility had constantly made him feel his obedience inadequate, his repentance "to be repented of." He quailed before the thought of death. But in the event he did not fear. He received Holy Communion for the last time, commended his soul to God in a most touching prayer, and died calmly four days later, his last words a blessing on a girl friend.

Leslie Stephen has pointed out the apparent paradox that "while no man sets a higher value on truthfulness than Johnson, no man could care less for speculative truth. His gaze was not directed to that side." I would go further. His gaze was deliberately averted from it. His answer to doubt was practical. "Whosoever will do My will, he shall know of the doctrine." Pascal, the great French thinker, perceived that speculative truth was at best a matter of probability. Man must wager. He can have no certainty. If he wager on eternity he may have a life filled with wretchedness, and then meet annihilation. The worldling then will triumph, having had this present life. "Yet," says Pascal, "I will wager for God, though the abyss yawn at my feet."

Johnson sees the abyss, averts his gaze, and, with no such sublime faith as the great Frenchman's, humbly does his duty to his neighbour, with a heart so tender, a tact of the heart so gentle, that we see in him a man filled with the love of God. "Le cœur a ses raisons, que la raison ne connait pas."

C. L. Primrose.

MISCELLANEA

NOTES

1. THE PSALMS

Hermann Gunkel's big Commentary on the Psalms is appearing in the Göttingen *Handkommentar zum Alten Testament* (Vandenhoeck and Ruprecht: 3 marks each part of 96 pages, 1925 and 1926). As readers of his Commentary on Genesis would expect, a rich feast is provided here. The notes are a miracle of condensation. The latest research in every department is utilized. But the wood always dominates the trees: the meaning of the psalm is always more important than philological details. The best way of recommending the book to English readers will be to expound one psalm with Gunkel's help. The second will suit our purpose; I translate it from the reconstructed Hebrew text, with the help of Gunkel's German version. The accents are an attempt to reproduce, for English readers, the rhythm of the original, which is 3+3 in all the verses except 5, 7 and 8, where it is 4+3; they do not profess to keep exactly to the Hebrew *ictus*.

1. Why do the Géntiles cómplain,
   And the nátions whísper in vaín ?
2. The kíngs of the eárth take cóunsel,
   The rúlers conspíre together:
3. "Let us breák their bánds asúnder,
   And cást their yóke fróm off us."

4. He that dwélleth in heáven laúghs,
   Yáhweh mócketh at thém.
5. But one dáy He will speák
   To thém in His wráth,
   He will térrify thém in His ráge.
6. To the ránk of His king am I raísed
   On Zíon, His hóly moúnt.

7. To mé He spáke:
   "I take theé on my láp,
   I have theé begótten this dáy.
8. Práy and I'll give thee
   Nátions for héritage,
   For póssession the énds of the wórld!
9. With an íron ród thou mayest smásh them,
   And breák them as póttery wáre."

10. Now thérefore be prúdent, ye kíngs,
    Be wárned, ye júdges of eárth.
11. Be subject to Yáhweh in feár,
    And kíss with trémbling His feét,
12. Lest He ráge and yé miss the wáy;
    For His wráth will quíckly be kíndled—
    Blessed thóse who find súccour in Hím!

This is a song written by a court-poet to express the sentiments of the king on the feast of his accession. It is quite unsuitable for Jewish kings, for which of them ever ruled over the nations ? It exactly describes what happened when a great king (of Assyria or Egypt) ascended the throne; subject nations invariably began to conspire on such occasions. The ode has therefore been taken over from foreign sources, and adapted for a Hebrew king. The date is pre-exilic, in the time of the monarchy.

Verse 7 clearly shows the spiritualization of the heathen idea, which is familiar from Egyptian and Babylonian sources. Thus Marduk is said to have begotten Hammurabi. But the phrase is purely spiritual here, signifying adoption; no suggestion of a mother appears. The antiquity of the material used is shown by the " iron rod " of *v.* 9. Iron is a great rarity and a fitting material for a royal sceptre. The holy hill of *v.* 6 reminds us of ideas current in Isaiah's time. It is very significant that the king in 10-12 requires obedience to Yahweh, not to himself.

Comparison with the exegesis in Peake's Commentary shows that Gunkel is very original and convincing. But, if his exegesis holds good, the Messianic meaning of the psalm disappears entirely. The king is the reigning monarch, revered in the same way as the kings of the surrounding Empires. But the conceptions are spiritualized just like the Babylonian Creation and Flood stories in Genesis. And on a purely materialistic view of Hebrew history, it is very hard to see why such stories should have been spiritualized.

We welcome the reaction shown in this book from extreme post-exilic dating and collectivist interpretation. Gunkel interprets many psalms as expressions of individual personal religion, and is far readier than most recent commentators to ascribe psalms to the time of the monarchy.

W. K. L. C.

---

2. THE LOST ENDING OF MARK

Was this ending in the copies of Mark used by the compilers of Matthew and Luke ? Dr. Streeter, in his recent book, denies it mainly on the ground that the angelic message (Mark xvi. 7) is directed to the Apostles, and especially St. Peter, bidding them meet their Risen Lord in Galilee. The lost ending, he therefore maintains, must have contained an account of a meeting in Galilee bringing St. Peter into prominence in connection with it. This we find neither in Matthew nor Luke. But although it must have contained a meeting in Galilee, and also some special mention of St. Peter, it does not seem so necessary that the two should be connected. A tradition existed, known to the writer of Luke and to St. Paul (1 Cor. xv. 5), that Our Lord vouchsafed an appearance of Himself to St. Peter before any of the other Apostles. Luke places this on Easter Day. The mention of St. Peter in the angelic message may be due either to his primacy or to his fall. No doubt exists in my mind that it was the latter. St. Peter was eating his heart out. He had denied his Master and the Master was dead and could never receive his confession. The mention of him in the message is partly a gracious assurance that forgiveness is awaiting him. Yet still, if only for his own satisfaction, the confession must be made. Therefore this special appearance to him; but what passed between the penitent and his Absolver was of so intimate and sacred a character that St. Peter never revealed it. Nothing more than the bare fact was ever known. May we not conjecture that this was recorded by his ἑρμηνευτής in the lost ending, and derived by Luke from that source ? On the other hand, Matthew records an appearance in Galilee, and I think signs of his frequent habit of conflating the Marcan with another account may be discerned in it. Matt. xxviii. 7 *f.* is quite clearly derived from the existing Marcan account, and gives the angelic message about the meeting in Galilee. The two

following verses, however, contain an appearance of Our Lord to the women, in which He repeats the same message. This seems to be a clear case of conflation, and each account thus conflated must have contained an appearance in Galilee, which it is not unreasonable to think Matthew may have similarly conflated. Matt. xxviii. 16-20 contains such an appearance, and in it we find (verse 17) "When they saw Him they worshipped Him, but some doubted." This candid confession of imperfection in the Apostles is very much in Mark's manner, and when we read the next verse beginning, "And Jesus came to them" after they had already seen and worshipped Him, the suspicion is confirmed that here we have a conflation. Also in Our Lord's command the double participle, *βαπτίζοντες, διδάσκοντες*, suggests a conflation, indeed a most happy one, but in this case we cannot assign the clauses to their sources. Is the final promise Marcan? *πάσας τὰς ἡμέρας* is a phrase occurring elsewhere in the Gospels only in Luke i. 75, but the nearest expression to it *ἐν ἐκείναις ταῖς ἡμέραις* is a favourite Marcan one, the emphasis laid by the order on the pronoun, as here on the adjective; and it only occurs in Matthew in a reproduction of Mark (xxiv. 19). But over against this very slight indication of conflation must be set the distinctively Matthæan phrase *ἡ συντελεία τοῦ αἰῶνος*; so the promise must be pronounced non-Marcan. Nevertheless, the record of this appearance, as a whole, bears marks of conflation with Mark.

I should conjecture the lost ending to have related how the women came and told their tale to the Apostles, saying nothing about any appearance of Our Lord to them; and the disbelief which it occasioned. This is abridged in Luke xxiv. 10-11, combined with a reminiscence in verse 10 of Mark xvi. 1. Verse 12, bracketed by Westcott and Hort as a "Western non-interpolation," if genuine, I should also assign to the Marcan account, which then proceeded to mention the fact that during St. Peter's return from the sepulchre Our Lord appeared to him, a fact which Luke, while here deserting the Marcan account, inserts *more suo* in the exclamation of the Apostles in xxiv. 34.

I regard Luke xxiv. 1-9 as belonging to the same source as that from which the writer drew the account of the visit to Emmaus. Omit verses 10-12 and the story runs much more smoothly. Especially does the significance of *καὶ πᾶσιν τοῖς λοιποῖς* (verse 9) come out. And it may also be observed that supposing v. 12 an interpolation, then v. 24 is inconsistent with v. 11; if v. 12 is genuine, still either it or v. 24 would be differently expressed if from the same source.

Finally, Mark went on to narrate the Galilæan appearance, and, as we have seen, Matthew conflates his account with that from which he drew Our Lord's appearance to the women.

That Luke should omit the Galilæan appearance may quite sufficiently be accounted for on the ground that he never aimed at exhaustiveness. He and the other Evangelists were not writing for posterity, but for special, and usually very limited, circles of readers. It was not as if they thought that what they omitted would thereby have doubt cast upon it in time to come. Quite trivial circumstances might in such cases decide the choice of incidents. Luke was influenced, I should imagine, first by preference for his other source as against Mark; and, secondly, by the fact that by confining himself to Jerusalem appearances he could, within the limits he had assigned himself, make a better ending from a literary point of view. The evident compression of Luke's account

of the Ascension, combined with the much fuller account in the Acts of the same event by, as I believe, the same author, suggests that after he had finished his gospel by a few words about it, he was not satisfied with them, and therefore enlarged on them in his next book.

That Matthew should omit the delivery of the message to the Apostles, and the appearance to St. Peter, was no doubt due to the difficulty of combining with the Marcan tradition in its completeness the story of our Lord's appearance to the women.

It is noteworthy that John in his twenty-first chapter gives us a Galilæan appearance in which St. Peter is prominent. If Mark records the angelic message in its original form, then John supplies another reason for the mention of St. Peter's name, and the only one for its mention in connection with Galilee. The charge to St. Peter is the only thing needed to complete the story of his fall and recovery. It is his public rehabilitation in his Apostolic office. Here, as so often, the Fourth Gospel fills up a gap left by the Synoptics. I cannot accept Dr. Streeter's view that the lost ending contained the appearance to St. Mary Magdalene and the charge to St. Peter. It rests on the supposition that the Fourth Gospel had only the remotest connection with John the son of Zebedee, a theory which I regard as incredible.

C. E. Scott Moncrieff.

VERSES

[The Archdeacon of St. Albans kindly allows us to print the two following Latin poems, with his own renderings into English. He says that the lines on the "Infans Anonymus" are said to be a Latin version by John Owen (1622) of a fourth or fifth century Greek original. We wonder whether any Hellenist would cap the Archdeacon's rendering by turning the lines into their original tongue. The second poem is said to have been written (in the Latin) by Mary Queen of Scots; but neither the Archdeacon nor Canon Ollard (who has made some search for it) knows where the original is.]

INFANS ANONYMUS ANTE BAPTISMUM MORTUUS

Mortuus heu! nec lotus aquâ, nec nomine notus,
Non habui nomen quod tibi, Christe, darem.
In libro vitæ Tu me sine nomine scribas:
Spes est in solo nomine nostra Tuo.

Oweni Epigrammatum, lib. iii. 187.

Dead! and unnamed my life, unwashed my soul,
Tossed to Thy Feet, a babe without a name.
Write me—me nameless—write me on Thy roll;
Thy Name, O Christ, will shelter me from shame.

Kenneth F. Gibbs.

PRAYER OF MARY QUEEN OF SCOTS

O Domine Deus, speravi in Te.
O Care, mi Jesu, nunc libera me.
In dura catena,
In misera pœna,
Desidero Te !
Languendo, gemendo et genuflectendo,
Adoro ! Imploro ! ut liberes me.

O Lord, O my God, I have trusted in Thee.
O Jesu, Beloved, deliver Thou me.
A prisoner friendless,
In misery endless,
I weary for Thee !
With sighing and crying, before Thy throne lying,
Adoring, imploring, deliver Thou me.

KENNETH F. GIBBS.

NOTES ON PERIODICALS

Analecta Bollandiana. (Tom. xliii., Fasc. 3 and 4.)

This number, one would be inclined to say, is extraordinarily interesting, if that description did not really apply to all numbers of this notable contribution to knowledge. It begins with a quantity of *Patriciana*, a collection of details relating to St. Patrick, mostly derived from the *Acta* of St. Benignus of Armagh. There is close criticism of recent Irish work on the subject. Then there are several additions to our knowledge of the persecution in 343 under Sapor II., from sources which had not been used sufficiently before, and of martyrs whose legendary history had not been fully investigated: this forms the "passionaire d'Adiabène." Fr. Delehaye concludes his study of the ancient Western records of miracles dealing mainly with the extremely important stories connected with St. Martin; and his conclusion is that, apart from their truth of fact, medieval miracles prove the confidence of Christians in the intercession of the saints; and it would need very strong reasons to believe that this was based on an illusion. A catalogue of the hagiographical MSS. in the chapter library at Novara follows with the text relating to St. Gunfort and SS. Faustus and Liberata. The reviews are as valuable as usual. Of special interest to English readers are those of Dr. Burkitt's *Religion of the Manichees* (Fr. Peeters thinks that if there were any Manicheans at Trinity College, Dublin, hearing the lectures, they must have felt that they were treated with indulgence and even sympathy), and of Dr. Banister's *Hereford*, Bp. Pearce's *Cobham*, and Mr. Boggis' and Miss Rose Troup's on Exeter, all favourable, and some kind words about the Clarendon Press edition of the Winchester statutes.

The Anglican Theological Review. Vol. viii. No. 3. (Ohio, U.S.A.)

Dr. Mercer contributes an important examination of the Precepts of Amen-em-ope (*circa* 900 B.C.), in which the agreements with Proverbs xxii. 17–xxiv. 22, point to Hebrew dependence upon the Egyptian text. A

phrase from Professor Ackerman deserves attention, that "in the realm of psychology proper we are beset . . . with psychologies rather than with a psychology."

The Canadian Journal of Religious Thought. Vol. ii. No. 3. (Ryerson Press, Toronto).

From the pen of Professor J. M. Shaw is an interesting article on the Essentials and Non-Essentials of the Christian Faith, in which we are reminded that the origin of the term "Fundamentalist" is to be found in the action of the Assembly of the Presbyterian Church of the U.S.A., who, in 1910, drew up a statement of certain fundamental and essential doctrines of the Presbyterian faith, five in number, in order to protect themselves from the preaching of certain young men—and, we may suppose, from the successors of those young men—who refused to acknowledge their adherence to the doctrine of the miraculous birth of Jesus. On this particular question the writer of the article defines his own position as follows: "Thus to deny the essentiality or centrality of the belief in the Virgin Birth to true Christian faith is not equivalent, it should be carefully noted, to denying the fact of the Virgin Birth. The present writer does not deny the fact; on the contrary, he inclines personally to belief in the fact. . . . The question is not as to the historicity of the fact of the miraculous birth, but as to whether belief in its historicity should be made essential or fundamental to Christian faith." To which, he thinks, the answer is in the negative.

We would commend the well-balanced article on the "Beginnings of Christological Doctrine," by Professor John Line, and an interesting paper on Bernard Shaw, by Professor Barker Fairley, in the same issue.

Nouvelle Revue Théologique. January, 1926.

A query is put to the Editor in this number on the subject of Confession and Direction. Can the ordinary confessor of a religious community, say, of nuns, demand from his penitents particulars about the degree of their habitual fidelity to the obligations of the religious life, their vows, spiritual exercises, domestic discipline, and so forth? He wishes to have these details in order to give direction and not a simple absolution. The Editor's answer is that the only information that can be *demanded* is that which is necessary to ensure a valid absolution. Questions may be put as regards the sincerity of the penitent's repentance, or of his professed purpose of amendment, but nothing beyond this can be demanded. No penitent is obliged to disclose venial faults or distant or unimportant occasions of even grave faults. But, on the other hand, every confessor, and especially the confessor of those who are aiming at Perfection, ought to attempt to give useful counsel to his penitents for their advancement in virtue. This is a work of charity. But if the penitent does not wish direction or desires it from another priest, it cannot be in any way forced upon him—confession and direction are with great profit associated with one another, but are by no means inseparable. Conversely, it would be imprudent for a priest to undertake direction of a person who never made sacramental confession to him, but it is not by any means necessary to hear his regular, frequent confessions every week or every fortnight. Freedom to choose a director is more especially necessary in the case of nuns whose ordinary confessor is appointed for them officially. To that confessor a nun is clearly within her rights if she make only the statements

strictly required for a valid sacrament, and she can go to some other priest of her choice for direction. A regular confessor, of course, may and should ask discreet questions in cases where no confidences are vouchsafed to him, for silence is often the effect of timidity only, but if confidences on which to base direction are not given after this, he must desist from seeming to demand them.

Revue d'Histoire Ecclésiastique.

In the January number the two articles of outstanding importance are those by A. d'Alès on the Meletian schism in Egypt, and on the most ancient biography of S. Amand, by E. de Moreau respectively. Old and new evidence on the Meletian schism is carefully given, and the help of psychology is invoked in order to make the persons concerned live. The danger that Athanasius perceived in Meletianism is clearly set out. The author frankly admits that on the principle *les absents toujours ont tort*, it is difficult to be fair to the Meletians, for we do not know their story at first-hand. It is but fitting that there should be a careful investigation of the earliest biography of S. Amand, who is the chief apostle of the north of Gaul. Father Moreau concludes that the *Vita Amandi* is neither the writing of Baudemond, in the second half of the seventh century, nor that of Gislebert of Saint-Amand, in the second half of the eighth. At elaborate length he sets forth his own considered judgment, which is that in the first half of the eighth century a clerk of Noyon composed it. The reviews of books are carefully done, and they enable us to note much that otherwise we may allow to slip. No feature of this valuable Review is more noteworthy than that calling our attention to the articles of historical worth published in the different countries. Of itself, this is enough to secure that everyone seriously interested in history of any kind must read these pages. We found, for instance, in the section on the "Histoire des Institutions et du Droit" notice of four articles which had escaped our attention.

Nouvelle Revue Théologique. December, 1925.

There is an interesting *Bulletin de Droit canonique*, containing reviews of the principal recent publications on Canon Law and allied subjects. Among the books noticed is an important work on Dispensations by Abbé J. Brys, I.C.D., published at Bruges. This work deals with Dispensations from the earliest times to the fourteenth century. M. Brys begins with distinguishing dispensations from tolerance of the violation of a law and from absolutions accorded to sins. The Fathers of the fourth and fifth centuries had a fairly accurate notion of a dispensation in the proper sense, but had as yet formulated no theory on the subject. The accurate theoretical distinction between dispensation, permission, privilege and absolution was first formulated by the Decretalists. A juridical definition of a dispensation is, however, to be found in Rufinus about 1157. In the first ages not even the Roman Pontiffs were considered competent to dispense from the disciplinary laws of apostolic origin or decreed by the four first General Councils. The idea of a dispensation seemed to contradict the Pope's office as guardian of the law. Little by little it was seen that the rigour of the law must be modified when the general good demanded it, since the law itself exists only in the interest of the general good. Not until later was the dispensing power of the Pope recognized as a consequence of his supreme power in matters

of discipline. The reviewer states that the most interesting part of M. Brys' book is that which treats of the object of a dispensation. Many centuries were necessary before the notion of natural law was distinguished from that of positive divine law or even from certain disciplinary precepts of the Old and New Testaments. The development of the legal theory on this subject from the end of the twelfth to the middle of the fourteenth century owed much on the one hand to the legislative initiative of the Popes, and on the other to the comparative study of the Roman and the Canon Law. This work of M. Brys is a thesis for his doctorate at Louvain.

The Journal of Religion. January, 1926.

This number includes an article of special importance for those English readers who are interested in education or religion in the U.S.A. The first is a review of Religious Education in the last quarter of a century, by Dr. Soares, Professor of Religious Education in the Divinity School of the University of Chicago. After noting the abandonment at the end of last century of the homiletic method for the instructional (or scholastic) method in Sunday Schools, Professor Soares recalls the new direction given to religious education by the work of G. Stanley Hall on the psychology of adolescents. Latterly under the influence of Professor Dewey, Dr. Coe and others have emphasized the social character of education. The old methods of imparting information have given place to new ones which aim at arousing interests and developing them. This change of method and developments of organization have, according to Dr. Soares, stimulated a significant discussion of worship. "Very appropriately the Sunday School had not used this term. Opening and closing exercises were the expression more fittingly describing what usually took place. But the education of children in religion meant a natural development of those attitudes of reverence, gratitude, loyalty, which, with their appropriate expression, we have been accustomed to call worship." Twenty-five years ago teaching was too much concerned with the intellect, too little with the child's emotional life. To-day the advance guard of religious educators use the "project" method, in which the interests of the child are paramount, and the child learns for itself, under expert guidance, how to use its intellect to satisfy its emotional demands. This change of method, as Dr. Soares indicates, has led to a reconstruction of the curriculum, and has evoked a discussion as to the very aim of Religious Education. If Religious Education is not to impart information about the Bible, etc., what is its aim? Dr. Soares writes: "We say that we are seeking a Christian world order. . . . How shall we train children so that they may bring about this Christian society? . . . The children must be trained as critics of the social order in which they find themselves."

An English review of Religious Education could hardly fail to devote much space to the problem of "church schools" and religious teaching in the state schools. Dr. Soares scarcely mentions the problem for the American "public"—*i.e.*, state school is quite definitely closed to denominational teaching. None the less the problem of weekday religious training remains; this problem still occupies the members of the Religious Education Association. Dr. Soares outlines some difficulties and some attempted solutions which will interest those who are interested in the same problem in English schools. It is a pity that he has not reviewed the work of the Daily Vacation Bible Schools, which many churches organize in the summer months as a solution for this problem.

REVIEW

DR. RAWLINSON'S ST. MARK

THE Westminster Commentaries are intended to "combine a hearty acceptance of critical principles with loyalty to the Catholic Faith." The latest addition to the series* possesses in a high degree both these qualifications; and before we go on to mention various points in which Dr. Rawlinson parts company from conservative tradition, it will be well to have before us in his own words his attitude towards the Catholic faith and its historical basis. "No form of Christianity," he writes, "which denies the affirmation made in A.D. 325 at Nicæa—viz., that the historical person, Jesus of Nazareth, is in His essential being eternally one with the eternal Father—has any future before it"; and again: "Some such story, some such events, as those which are recorded in the Gospel are required as the historical explanation of the rise of the Christian religion. The creative fact behind the rise of Christianity is the historical Jesus—a Jesus as divine as God and as human as man" (Introd., pp. xxii *f.*).

In fifty pages of Introduction Dr. Rawlinson first sketches the rise and character of Christian traditions in general (ch. i.), and of S. Mark's Gospel in particular (ch. ii., "The Earliest Written Gospel"); then he discusses its authorship, date, and place of writing (ch. iii.), and its stylistic features (ch. iv.). Chapter v., "The Criticism of the Gospel," deals with Mark's relation to the other Synoptists and Q and to Paulinism, and with general questions of sources and redactions. Three chapters follow on the "Supernatural Element in the Gospel," "The Theology of the Gospel," and "The Religious Value of the Gospel"; this last an impressive appreciation of St. Mark's message for the present day. The concluding chapter is a Bibliography; a traditionalist reviewer may be permitted to drop a dutiful tear at the omission of Dr. Swete's commentary from the list of "specially valuable" books.

On the Marcan authorship of the Gospel, the date—here narrowed down to the years 65–67—and the Roman *provenance*, Dr. Rawlinson follows tradition, though his treatment is fresh and independent. Perhaps he does not attach enough weight to the arguments which may be urged in favour of an earlier date (*e.g.*, by Harnack and Allen), especially the admitted priority of Mark to the highly apocalyptic Gospel of St. Matthew. St. Irenæus, in stating that Mark was written after the deaths of SS. Peter and Paul, may be relying only on a plausible conjecture, and quite certainly supposed Mark to be later than Matthew.

* *The Gospel according to St. Mark:* by A. E. J. Rawlinson, D.D. Methuen. 16s.

Closely connected with the question of date is that of the Petrine character of the Gospel. That the stories which reflect discredit on St. Peter come *ultimately* from the Apostle himself Dr. Rawlinson is disposed to admit; but he departs from tradition —and from the position of so acute a modern critic as Professor C. H. Turner—in minimizing the element of direct dependence on St. Peter. Yet it is difficult to suppose that one who was St. Peter's attendant at Rome, and called by him "my son" (1 Pet. v. 13), could have failed to be influenced both intimately and extensively by the Apostle's own reminiscences; which, moreover, would probably have been noted down by the future Evangelist some time before the Gospel itself was formally "written." Dr. Rawlinson holds that the inclusion in the Gospel of the stories above mentioned can be fully explained, and only explained, on the supposition that St. Peter's character had now been "transfigured by martyrdom." On the contrary, all that we know both of human affection and of epitaphs, tends to suggest that St. Mark would have drawn a nobler picture of his spiritual father's early days had he felt free to do so—*i.e.*, had not St. Peter himself desired the humiliating truth to be candidly recorded. To maintain this view is by no means to deny that St. Mark used other sources as well; Dr. Rawlinson with great probability postulates a document Q^R—the version of Q (our Lord's teaching), current in Rome.*

We pass on to chapter vi., "The Supernatural Element in the Gospels." Here Dr. Rawlinson is both interesting and discreet; some readers will doubtless find him too discreet. There are two dicta which the conservative will applaud: "Belief in the Incarnation involves certainly the belief that God has acted in history in ways that are unique," and "to rationalize these stories (*i.e.*, of miraculous occurrences) is to destroy them." But then we are bidden to remember that the Evangelists and their contemporaries had a simple belief in the supernatural, untempered by philosophical and scientific reflection; and from the point of view of *purely historical* criticism we cannot say more than that "contemporary witnesses believed that the Lord Jesus had worked miracles" and His disciples after Him. If we turn to the Commentary for light on special miracles, Dr. Rawlinson gently refuses to lead us further. In connection with the stilling of the storm, for example, we read that "the broad faith of the Christian doctrine of the Incarnation once assumed, no wise person will proceed rashly to draw the limit between what is and what is not possible; in particular instances it must be left to the individual reader of the Gospel

* This, when combined with S.P. (St. Peter), gives us the satisfactory designation of S.P.Q.R. for the Roman Gospel thus derived.

to judge of the historical probabilities for himself." On the raising of Jaïrus' daughter—"it is plainly impossible now to determine . . . what the original facts may have been"; but that St. Mark "meant to describe a resurrection, and not merely a recovery from a swoon, appears unquestionable."* We might wish that Dr. Rawlinson felt able to commit himself more definitely; but we ought to be grateful both for his rejection of a priori dogmatism and for his refusal *as a historian* to go further than he thinks the strictly historical evidence allows. On one point he is very definite indeed; he sweeps away all demons to the "region of myth"; their recognition of Our Lord is but an inference drawn by St. Mark himself from their supernatural character. We may doubt whether the last word on demons and demoniacal possession has yet been said; Dr. Rawlinson's discussion of it (pp. xlviii *f.*) approaches very near to the "rationalizing" against which he has warned us.

We have now drifted from the Introduction into the Commentary proper; let it be said at once that this part of the work is a model of what a Greekless commentary ought to be. To read a commentary straight through is generally a formidable task; to do so for the purposes of a review adds a further touch of grim constraint. But Dr. Rawlinson carries his learning so easily and distils it so attractively that the task has proved not only edifying but wholly delightful. The Gospel story is divided up into short sections, and each section is followed by exactly the notes which are required; always lucid and pointed, never long enough to be tedious, never so short as to be obscure. Where fuller notes are required they are forthcoming, but so arranged as not to interrupt the steady reading of the Gospel; *e.g.*, there are two "General Notes"—on Mark viii. 27 to x. 45, and on chapter xiii.—at convenient breaks in the narrative, and eight "Additional Notes" at the end, occupying between them some twenty pages.

We have only space here to touch on three points of special interest: (1) Our Lord's use of parables; (2) St. Peter's confession and its sequel; and (3) the interpretation of the Apocalyptic chapter xiii.

1. Dr. Rawlinson's view is that parables are essentially simple and intelligible; and that our Lord's parables in their original context were such. Therefore he ascribes to later Christian thought any words which suggest that the disciples required an explanation (*e.g.*, the explanation of the Sower ascribed by Mark to our Lord), or that such explanations were deliberately withheld by our Lord from "those without."

* Yet does it "appear unquestionable" if Mark is not read here in the light of Matthew or Luke? The definite statements that the damsel was dead come from the two later Gospels.

Yet the crucial words from Is. vi. 9 *f.* seem to be too deeply rooted in the early Christian tradition not to go back to our Lord; and the right interpretation of them, which Dr. Rawlinson has on page 51, makes his reference to our Lord's supposed "deliberate intention of being misunderstood" (page 49) quite beside the mark. Parables "intended to stimulate and challenge thought" would naturally lead the faithful to inquire further into their meaning, and inevitably harden the hearts of those who refused to receive their teaching. The supposed esotericism of Mark is completely absent from the Fourth Gospel; but we find there the same verdict, from Isa. vi., passed on unbelief.*

2. St. Peter's Confession as described in Mark viii. 27 *ff.* is not, Dr. Rawlinson thinks, of the same crucial importance to the story as it is in Matthew. This view is not novel (see, *e.g.*, Moffatt, *Introd. Lit. N.T.*, 3, p. 219), but it is largely disregarded to-day, and if true, as it probably is, it needs emphasizing. The real point of the Cæsarea Philippi episode, as Dr. Rawlinson shows, is *our Lord's own interpretation of His Messiahship in terms of the Cross.* The ascription to Him of the title Messiah without any such qualification He definitely rebukes (the A.V. and R.V. conceal the true meaning of the Greek word by rendering "He charged them"; see the notes *ad loc.*).

3. Mark xiii. is still an unsolved problem. Dr. Rawlinson in his "General Note" draws attention to the "real element of truth in the old-fashioned phrase about the prophetic 'foreshortening of the future.' The Kingdom of God is at hand—and the prophet's faith projects it upon the canvas of his vision in such a way that it appears to be already imminent, and dominates his outlook. Certitude assumes the psychological form of a sense of immediacy." Still, the general character of the chapter, with all its detail of prediction, is very different from the rest of our Lord's recorded sayings; and Dr. Rawlinson leans towards Colani's theory that the chapter incorporates with sayings of our Lord a short independent apocalypse which is not Dominical in origin, but probably Jewish-Christian. The passages belonging to it are vv. 7–8, 14–20, 24–27. This solution cannot be called satisfactory, but it is probably the best at present available.

Beyond this we must not go, though there are countless further points which tempt discussion. Suffice it to say that Dr. Rawlinson's book is a noble product of that true religion combined with sound learning which Oxford cherishes as Heaven's choicest gift to a Christian University.

ERIC GRAHAM.

* *Cf.* also 2 Cor. iv. 3 (R.V.): the "veiling" of the Gospel is due to no intention of St. Paul, but to the working of a spiritual law.

NOTICES

THE CAMBRIDGE ANCIENT HISTORY. Vol. III. Cambridge University Press. 35s.

The third volume of this monumental undertaking is even more exciting to theologians than its predecessors, for they find here the great age of Hebrew prophecy described by an expert with the background of the surrounding Empires brilliantly sketched in by other specialists. Whereas the Cambridge Modern and Mediæval Histories summarize the knowledge contained in big books, a volume like the present gives the reader a great deal which is not elsewhere obtainable. The work of research, by both excavators in the field and students at home, has proceeded with accelerated pace since the War, and even quite recent books need considerable supplementing.

This volume is entitled, from its main subject, "The Assyrian Empire," from *c.* 1000 to 612 B.C. Other chapters deal with the Hittites, Urartu, the Scythians, the Neo-Babylonian Empire typified for us by Nebuchadnezzar, Anatolia, Greece, Lydia, and the era of Greek Colonial Expansion; four important chapters are devoted to Israel. It is a great pleasure to read Dr. Sayce's account of Urartu (Ararat) or Van, the later Armenia, which plays so important a part in Assyrian history. A few brilliant scholars have toilsomely reconstructed a lost chapter in human history; how much more, we wonder, still awaits investigators?

During the War Biblical students were wont to point to Assyria as the type of a ruthless militarism which trampled upon smaller states with their distinctive cultural values. So long as we form our political judgments of the ninth, eighth, and seventh centuries B.C. from exclusively Jewish sources we shall be tempted to come to the same decision, and to contrast the Assyria which Isaiah defied unfavourably with the Babylonia which Jeremiah favoured. But in Mr. Sidney Smith's exhaustive chapters Assyria assumes a different guise. It appears as the first fully organized Empire, ruling efficiently over subject races, in the history of the world. If our knowledge were fuller, the gaps of history could be filled in and we should see how the Assyrian tradition passed to the Neo-Babylonian Empire, thence to the Persian, and so on until it became a permanent factor in world development. Some of Mr. Smith's sentences may be quoted. "Few Oriental monarchs have displayed more interest in the welfare of their citizens than Sennacherib" (p. 77). "The Assyrians would seem to have been more gloomy and fanatical in their religious beliefs than the Babylonians" (p. 92). "In many particulars the guild organization of the Assyrian *ummane* corresponded to the mediæval craft guilds of Western Europe" (p. 97). "Assyrian law was in no way derived from the Babylonian codes" (p. 104). It is interesting to learn that Assyria and Babylonia were as different in their cultures as Greece and Rome.

Mr. Campbell Thompson contributes a wonderful chapter on "The Influence of Babylonia." The Babylonian pharmacopœia contained some 550 different drugs, some of which still survive in medical treatment. The Phœnician traders brought many Babylonian customs to Europe. Even words; for Mr. Thompson has an amazing list of linguistic borrowings, some of which have even reached English. For example: Hangar,

gypsum, camel, plinth, rose, jasper, cherry, cummin, myrrh, naphtha, sack, terebinth, carob—to pick out a few only. Astronomy is of Babylonian origin. " The religion of Babylon has passed on its legends, from the very ' babble ' of babes and the Noah's Ark of the nursery to Nimrod of the hunting field and St. George with his Dragon of the hostelry; from the mandragora of Shakespeare to the winking Marybud which enshrines the name of the great Mother after its ancient forebears, the daisy of Venus, the ' flower of Dilbat '; and from the Seven Gates of Hell which have led to the Seventh Heaven " (p. 250).

Dr. S. A. Cook writes on the History of Israel and Judah with great clearness and originality. His chapters alone make the History indispensable to the Biblical student. His views are well known by now; though they do not command the general adhesion of scholars, they are taken very seriously. The Old Testament historical books, including the Pentateuch, are in their present form mainly a product of the sixth century. Those elements which have been thought to point to a simple pre-monarchical régime, are really post-monarchical, a product of the time when Palestinian society reverted to a less organized state. The old pre-prophetic religion lived on side by side with the new prophetic religion. This is not opinion but fact, proved by the results of excavation.

When we have read many books on 2 Isaiah and the Servant of Yahweh, Dr. Cook's treatment still comes as something fresh and inspiring. The age of the exile was one of widespread religious awakening—Lao-tse and Confucius in China, the Buddha in India, Zoroaster (probably) in Persia, and the movement lying behind Isaiah xl.-lv. This last is the highest point of Israelite religion; here we have sublime monotheism, universalism, and salvation through vicarious suffering. The ideas are unique in the O.T. The tragedy of Isa. liii. was not developed as a practical doctrine. " There is a late and obscure reference to a people's penitence from the martyrdom of one ' whom they had pierced,' whose death led to the purgation and deliverance of Jerusalem (Zech. xii.)." Some, at least, realized the value of the new conceptions, or the passages would not have been preserved. " The uniqueness of the ideas corresponds to that of those who depicted the figure, or of the figure himself, or, rather, of both. The expected Servant had passed away, rejected, almost a failure, and unrecognized save by the few—and of these the writer of Isa. liii. was one." Something great and mysterious happened, which has been hushed up. " Modern research does not regard the Servant as the prophetic portrayal of Jesus, but in view of the persistent Messianic interpretation in the past any other must at least make the old one explicable. . . . The Servant was rejected in his lifetime, but all the hints suggest that his influence upon subsequent Judaism was simply vital. He left no clear trace in literature, one looks in vain for references to him or to a sect or other body; and this is very noteworthy whatever view one adopts. . . . Accordingly, the Unknown One of Israel falls into line with the great religious figures who range from China to Greece during the middle centuries of the first millennium B.C."

The *Cambridge Ancient History* offers no consolation to those who would " reconcile " the Bible with the monuments. But one closes its volumes, and this one in particular, with a vivid sense of God in human history, manifesting Himself in the majestic procession of events, but chiefly in His servants the prophets, by whom He spake.

W. K. L. Clarke.

ESSAYS AND LETTERS ON ORDERS AND JURISDICTION. By F. W. Puller. Longmans. 10s. 6d.

Much gratitude is due to Fr. Puller for this volume. Most of it has seen the light before, but it is all of enduring value and is welcome in the permanent form in which it now appears.

Part I.—on "the Grace of Orders and Apostolic Succession"—is very timely, and the author's arguments should be considered by those who are inclined to react from the traditional Anglican insistence on Episcopal Ordination. He proves very convincingly that the whole weight of Church authority upholds the view that our Lord Himself imparted distinctive gifts to the Apostles and intended thereby to institute an apostolic ministry. He then proceeds to a closely-reasoned defence of the principle of transmission as *one* element in the idea of apostolic succession, and certainly seems to dispose effectively of the paradoxical contention that this is a mere Tractarian invention. Opinions will probably differ whether the case for the universal restriction to Bishops of the power of ordaining is proved up to the hilt. He does not give any explanation of the fact that there was apparently no monarchical Bishop at Corinth at the time of the Epistle of St. Clement; and, while stating quite truly that there is no evidence whatever for the theory that any presbyter could ordain, he does not deal with the view that there was a time when, in some places at any rate, the *college* of presbyters had this power.

Part II. is written to prove that all the best authorities teach that all the Bishops taking part in the Consecration of a Bishop are, jointly and severally, ministers of the Sacrament of Order. It is full of Fr. Puller's characteristic erudition, but overlaps rather unfortunately with Part III. on "Careless Baptisms and the Transmission of the Apostolic Ministry." In one important point the two essays seem to contradict each other; but it must be noted that Part III. was written in 1910, Part II. in 1922. In Part III. Fr. Puller says that he knows of no one, except Bishop Matthew, who now holds the theory that the transmission of the episcopate is effected only by the principal Consecrator; but in Part II. he says that this assertion is continually made by Roman controversialists in England, and that it may be the view of some less-instructed Roman divines; while later on in the same Part, on p. 82, he seems to assert that it is the *communis sententia* at Rome. It can hardly be the case that this *sententia* only became *communis* between 1910 and 1922, and it seems a pity that Fr. Puller has not made clear what is his finally considered opinion.

Part IV. is the well-known and monumental tractate on "the Bull *Apostolicæ Curæ* and the Edwardine Ordinal," which has taught some of us almost all we know of the Catholic theory of validity in the conferring of Holy Orders.

Part V. is the only portion of the volume which is now printed for the first time. It deals with "the spiritual jurisdiction of Bishops in the Church at large and in the Church of England," and is of first-rate importance. It is a subject on which many Anglicans would confess that their ideas were in a state of confusion. Fr. Puller maintains that not only had the Apostles both an ecumenical mission and ecumenical jurisdiction, but that they passed it on to their successors. He supports this contention as to the essentially ecumenical character of the episcopal office by a powerful catena of authorities down to the time of the Council of Trent. By divine right all Bishops have authority everywhere, but

by ecclesiastical law they are inhibited from exercising it except when and where the Church permits. By Consecration, therefore, a world-wide authority is given, and by canonical Consecration to a particular see, or by translation, the inhibition is *pro tanto* removed. He quotes a passage from St. John Chrysostom to show that every Bishop should exercise a "solicitude" for the whole Church, a point which is noteworthy in view of the use which Papalist theologians make of the evidence for the world-wide "solicitude" of the Papacy from the earliest times. But, indeed, Fr. Puller's argument might be made to cut both ways. On the one hand, it shows that the "care of all the Churches" is, as we might have gathered from St. Paul, not an exclusively Petrine prerogative; but, on the other, it might seem to suggest that there is nothing impossible, if the Church so wills, in the idea of one particular Bishop exercising world-wide jurisdiction; and if the Church did so will, that Bishop's authority would be divine, not merely ecclesiastical. The Church would only have removed an inhibition, and at once the divinely given, world-wide authority of that Bishop would become effective. If such a theory of Papal jurisdiction were ever elaborated, the result would be that the Pope and the Diocesan Bishop would have *equal* rights *jure divino* within the latter's Diocese, and that any *additional* authority granted to the Pope would be ecclesiastical. Obviously the current Roman theories which make the Pope, if not the source, at least the dispenser of all jurisdiction, cannot be accommodated to the Cyprianic view of episcopal authority at all; but a time may come when a tolerable interpretation of *jure divino* may be welcomed in more quarters than one.

The rest of this Part is occupied with a vindication of the canonical position of the English Episcopate.

Part VI. is a contention that the Catholic Church knows nothing of the Patriarchal system as a necessary part of her organization; while Part VII. deals with the relation of Religious to their Bishops.

It is indisputable that future scholars will gather rich fruits from these labours of Fr. Puller, spread over so many years, in fields of knowledge which he has made so peculiarly his own.

K. D. Mackenzie.

The Sacramentary (Liber Sacramentorum), Historical, and Liturgical Notes on the Roman Missal. By Ildefonso Schuster. Vol. II. Translated by Arthur Levelis-Marke. Burns Oates and Washbourne. 15s.

The second volume of this great work is naturally of less general interest than the first, inasmuch as a larger part of it consists of detailed notes on the Proper of the Mass. Not that these notes are dull: on the contrary, the variations in Eucharistic worship from Septuagesima to Pentecost are brilliantly illustrated and explained at every turn by details of local Roman custom in the golden age of liturgy. It would not have occurred to every one, for instance, that the "just punishment for our offences" spoken of in the collect for Septuagesima was the Lombard Terror; still less that the Epistle for that day may have been chosen in allusion to the athletic feat of walking to the Basilica of St. Lawrence Without the Walls for the stational Mass! So, again, opening the book almost at random, we find that the references to "Jerusalem" in the Mass for the Fourth Sunday in Lent are to be explained by the fact that the stational church was Santa Croce in Gerusalemme with its venerated

relic of the true Cross, and this fact again by the Byzantine custom of keeping a feast of the Holy Cross in the middle of Lent.

The sections of most interest to the general reader are those which deal with the ceremonies of the Easter Triduum, on which our author is both informative and frank. Thus we learn that a peculiarity of Maundy Thursday in the Gregorian period was that three Masses were celebrated; that the holy oil of the sick consecrated on that day was freely used by the faithful as a kind of spiritual preventive medicine; but that in times of serious sickness they would send for the priests that it might be sacramentally applied. His frankness is sometimes startling, though, as he is careful to explain, he has no intention of criticizing adversely the present customs of the Church. Still, he does allow himself to say that the anointing of the priest's hands with the oil of catechumens is an unmeaning Gallican addition to the Ordinal, and that all such unctions are "fantastic and imaginative." So he points out that the original intention of abstaining from Communion on Good Friday was for the observance of the fast, and asserts that the present custom of no one but the Celebrant communicating "represents a feeble—indeed, one might almost say a distorted—reflection" of the primitive rule. He regrets the arrangement by which the Adoration of the Cross is inserted into the middle of the Mass of the Presanctified, and seems almost aghast at the confusion which characterizes the rite of Holy Saturday. The special ceremonies connected with the "Altar of Repose" are traced to the limitations on outdoor processions imposed by the Papal residence at Avignon.

There is much description of the baptismal rites, in the course of which a most interesting explanation is given of the term "Confirmation." It was thought of, he says, as standing in the same relation to Baptism as the Epiclesis stands to the Consecration; and in the Mozarabic rite the Epiclesis is called *Confirmatio Sacramenti*. But does not this beg the question whether there ever was an epiclesis in the Roman rite?

This is a book which every admirer of the Missale Romanum will wish to possess.

K. D. Mackenzie.

The English Church and the Reformation. By C. S. Carter, Litt.D. New edition. Longmans. 5s.

This revised edition has a new chapter dealing with the main results of the English Reformation. Some excellent illustrations have been added, and the book has literary attractiveness as well. Moreover, the author obviously wishes to contribute light rather than heat to his difficult subject. As is almost inevitable, his history does sometimes seem a little coloured by his convictions. It really is not the case that the Papal claims rested entirely on the Forged Decretals, nor even that the latter were written to prove the universal jurisdiction of the Pope. He might have mentioned that before the Reformation the King generally got his own way in the appointment of the Bishops. Nor were all "acts of adoration" omitted in the 1549 Prayer-Book, for the *Agnus*, the *only* public act of this character, was retained. Finally, the significance of the alteration of "Doctrine of the Schoolmen" into "Romish doctrine" ought to be pointed out. But no doubt Dr. Carter is entirely right in his main contention that the English Reformation, both in fact and in intention, amounted to far more than the mere rejection of the Papal claims.

K. D. Mackenzie.

THE CHURCH OF THE SPIRIT. By F. G. Peabody. Macmillan. 7s. 6d.

The emeritus Professor of Christian Morals in Harvard University possesses a fluent and persuasive style. His sentences glide smoothly, his antitheses are facile, his quotations are apt, his "illustrations" copious; and he uses them all on behalf of what he and others call "Liberal Christianity," for which he claims that it "makes the daring assertion that the Christian Church, in great areas of its history, has been tempted to follow the wrong track; to assume as essential what is in fact incidental; to set definition before discipleship, speculation before inspiration, the letter before the spirit." Could not the same be said, for instance, of Francis of Assisi in days when daring of this sort was even more daring than in our prosaic times? It seems to one reader that, as with the old-fashioned setting up of prophet *versus* priest, this antithesis between Institution and Experience, between Authority and Spirit, is over-emphasized.

St. Francis was a reformer or revolutionary as much as any "Liberal Christian," but he did not "propose a complete subordination of the external organization of the Christian religion to a revival of its spiritual simplicity and power."

"These ought ye to have done, and not to leave the other undone," is a divine sentence of wide application.

This book contains the substance of three Hibbert Lectures given at Oxford in April last year, and though the reading of it is an exercise not without profit or pleasure, it may be doubted whether the "Church of the Spirit" in any visible or corporate form has ever existed. Perhaps the sub-title of the book is illuminating—"A Brief Survey of the Spiritual Tradition in Christianity." So, then, Tradition may be spiritual after all, and our faith is still robust enough to believe that in handing it on even an organized and Episcopal Church has played its part.

A. E. SMITH.

A PRACTICAL FAITH. By Harold Anson. Allen and Unwin. 3s. 6d.

This stimulating book is written from the "St. Martin's-in-the-Fields" point of view, with a preface by the Vicar. It deals with such great topics as God, prayer, immortality, salvation, love and passion, religion and politics, and deals with them in a suggestive fashion. The author begins with a picture painted in vivid, not to say lurid, colours of the religion of our childhood and "conventional" religion. Here, as elsewhere in the book, there is a certain amount of exaggeration. "Empire Day" is, rather unfairly, put side by side with "Derby Day" as "celebrations of national mysteries of religion." Moses and Ramsay MacDonald are joined together as social reformers. Politics are described as something that "may have become a rather disreputable wrangle of covetous and obscene place-hunters." In these days it is perhaps necessary to shout in order to be heard. And Mr. Anson, if he sometimes shouts, always deserves to be heard. His handling of the subjects he discusses is fresh and original. From the Catholic point of view the least satisfactory part of the book is the section on the Religion of Jesus. Theologians might call some of its statements "temerarious."

H. W. FULFORD.

JOHN HENRY NEWMAN. By Newport J. D. White, D.D., Canon of St. Patrick's and Archbishop King's Professor in the University of Dublin. S.P.C.K. 4s. 6d.

This volume exhibits the excellences, and some of the limitations, of Irish Churchmanship. It is a sound and scholarly study of Newman in his Anglican days. If it adds nothing that is new to our knowledge of the history of his life down to his entry into the Church of Rome, it provides a clear, readable, and well-proportioned narrative, interspersed with shrewd criticism. Even if Dr. White lacks sympathy with certain sides of Newman's character, and fails to appreciate the permanent value of many of his ideas, especially in the light of modern psychology, yet his comments are penetrating and always deserve attention. We may wish that he had discussed more fully the view of revelation as implied in Newman's early writings. Perhaps the most fundamental difference between Roman and modern Anglican theology is that Rome holds fast to the idea of, so to say, a "block-revelation." The form in which Newman held a similar view prepared the way for his acceptance of the full Roman doctrine. As regards Newman's attitude to the Thirty-nine Articles, Dr. White seems hardly to understand the complexity of the issue. Dr. Stone, for instance, has shown conclusively that "Romanenses" is employed in contemporary sources with very varied meanings, and hence its significance in Article 22 is highly disputable. In all cases it is essential to discover whether the decrees of Trent were known to the compilers of the Articles, or whether they, like the Council of Trent itself, had in mind current popular teaching. But we do not wish to end on a note of criticism. This book is up to the standard of the "English Theologians" series, and that is high praise.

E. J. BICKNELL.

JEREMY TAYLOR. By W. J. Brown. S.P.C.K. 6s.

This interesting and careful study appears in the "English Theologians" series, published by S.P.C.K. Canon Brown has presented Jeremy Taylor, therefore, as a theological teacher with a message for to-day rather than as preacher, writer of devotional literature, and master of English prose. A convenient statement of Bishop Taylor's life and times is followed by summaries of the teaching of all the more important works, frequent quotations being supplied and numerous references to Eden's revision of Heber's edition of *Taylor's Works*, 1847-1852, for the assistance of the student. The chapters on religious toleration, sin and repentance and the sacraments, will be found full of matter relevant to the ecclesiastical problems and theological controversies of our own day; and Canon Brown's fair and understanding presentation of Taylor's teaching merits the full consideration particularly of those who lightly claim the Bishop's authority in support of extravagances which he never countenanced.

To be critical on one small matter, I am not sure that the author is right when, on p. 100, he contends that the line of argument used by Bishop Taylor against the practice of extreme unction would lead to a disavowal of the efficacy of infant baptism, which, of course, he strenuously defended. When Taylor asserts that "no rational man can think that any ceremony can make a spiritual change, without a spiritual act of him that is to be changed," he has in view the adult person capable of

making some kind of spiritual act. In the case of an infant there is as yet no such capacity. In both unction and baptism the sacramental act is a social act, marked by the prayers of the Church and efficacious by virtue of the joint action of the Church and the individual recipient, according to the capacity of the individual. In the administration of baptism the Church does not wait for conscious participation in the case of the infant, however, because, though it *is* an infant, wholly dependent at present upon the society in which it finds itself, it is yet growing hourly in its ability to make response to the social influences that are brought to bear upon it; and the baptism that is administered is but the first step in that sacramental action which finds its completion in the confirmation of the conscious and spiritually awakened child or adolescent. But it would appear to be a very different matter, and one involving the most grave responsibility, for the Church to regard an unconscious, or nearly unconscious, dying man or woman, as occupying the same position in respect of sacramental ministrations as an unconscious infant. To decide against the one is not, it seems to me, to decide against the other.

O. HARDMAN.

THE ETHICS OF THE GOSPEL. By F. A. M. Spencer. Allen and Unwin. 7s. 6d.

THE DIVINE SOCIETY: CHRISTIAN DOGMA AND SOCIAL REDEMPTION. By W. G. Peck. S.C.M. 6s.

The re-interpretation of Christian Ethics in terms of the corporate life of the members of the Kingdom of God proceeds with gathering force, and with a hopeful measure of agreement from representatives of the various types of English Christianity. The necessity for building the ethical structure upon the theological foundation is now commonly acknowledged; and every structure that is being reared represents an earnest attempt to apply Christian teaching to the solution of our modern social and industrial problems.

Mr. Spencer's book keeps strictly to its title. Our Lord's teaching as recorded in the Gospels is presented, freshly and fairly, in a work which is offered as a contribution towards the discharge of the Church's great task, namely, "the complete moralization of human society on the basis of the Christian religion." The opening chapters deal with the general principles of Christian morality: at the end comparison is made with certain types of philosophical ethics; and the body of the book treats acutely and helpfully, with independence of judgment, of such problems as the non-resistance of evil, the use of riches, the relation of the sexes, and the practice of Christian asceticism.

Passing to Mr. Peck's book, we find a still greater measure of departure from the old individualistic standpoint that was so characteristic of books on Christian Ethics until recent years. Here is a strong grip on the essential doctrines of Christianity, a clear understanding that ethical truth is a necessary deduction from these doctrines, and, above all, a firm faith in the Church as the Society of the Incarnation, the organization by means of which human society is to be redeemed. This is a book of real insight and stirring appeal. The social consequences of the Faith could scarcely be more convincingly stated.

O. HARDMAN.

THE QUEST FOR GOD IN CHINA. By F W. S. O'Neill. Allen and Unwin. 7s. 6d.

The great world of China presents problems and opportunities to the Church of to-day which are unsurpassed in magnitude and urgency by those of any other part of what is known as "the Mission Field." And ignorance of these is culpable in the highest degree now that they have been so clearly set forth from different angles by men with expert knowledge. This, the most recent of the admirable books that have been given us on the subject of Chinese religion, is in some ways the most interesting and the most informing for the reader who desires to know of the latest movements and the actual existing state of things. Delivered in substance as lectures to the students of the Belfast Presbyterian College by one who has spent twenty-eight years in the Irish Presbyterian Mission, they will commend themselves to all Christians by the rich material they contain and by the earnestness and the love they reveal.

It is of especial interest to notice, as in another recent book on China, a frank recognition of the need for ascetic Christianity and the proclamation of the ideal of renunciation. In attempting to estimate the reasons for the appeal of Buddhism, the author suggests that "the imperious desire for immolation" perhaps approaches nearest to the heart of the matter; and he regrets that "owing to the history of Protestantism and the contamination of a social system, the basis of which is the antithesis of renunciation, this great ideal is largely forgotten among us or despised." But it is surely returning.

O. HARDMAN.

THE CHURCHMAN'S POPULAR LIBRARY

WHAT MEAN YE BY THESE STONES? Suggestions to Readers of the Old Testament. By J. M. C. Crum. DEATH AND THE HEREAFTER. By Henry Lowther Clarke, D.D., formerly Archbishop of Melbourne. A RELIGION FOR MONDAY MORNING. By K. E. MacLean. S.P.C.K. Limp duxeen, 1s.; cloth boards, 1s. 6d. net.

These three volumes are the first of a new series on popular lines published by the S.P.C.K. We must begin by congratulating the Society on their attractive appearance. Not so very long ago we blushed for the S.P.C.K. books on our shelves. They were for the most part badly bound, tawdry, and looked cheap. On the other hand, these volumes are excellently got up and are marvellous value for the money. We cannot imagine how it is done.

Mr. Crum's book is a delightful variation from the ordinary manual of instruction in the Old Testament, which is often clear, earnest, and informative, but rather dull. Mr. Crum is never dull. His pages abound in delightful quotations and fancies. He will not, indeed, supersede the more prosaic textbooks. Many of his readers may at times get a little bewildered by his nimble imagination, and be glad to turn to their pedestrian pages for fuller and more orderly information. But they will go back to the Old Testament with minds stimulated by the charm and spiritual insight of this little book.

Dr. Lowther Clarke gives expression to the faith of an old man, as in the eventide of life he looks forward into the hereafter. Some, no doubt, will regard his teaching as vague. There is certainly no attempt to be more definite than the New Testament. But many, especially elderly

persons accustomed to study their Bibles with little interest in modern ideas, will find here just what they need. In the last resort all belief in a future life rests on faith in the goodness of God. Such faith is infectious, and can be caught from these pages.

Mr. Maclean, a New Zealand priest, provides exactly the kind of book that will be useful to many parish priests in their own preparation of candidates for Confirmation. His teaching is fresh, clear, and sane. His illustrations are excellent. Such a book will also be of service for placing in the hands of men and women who have forgotten the teaching which they once received, or have got wrong ideas of what the Church teaches. We can thoroughly recommend it as a popular exposition of life in the Christian Church. Chap. viii. raises the hope that one day the author will give us a study of our Lord's life not less vivid, but more satisfying, than Dr. Glover's *Jesus of History*.

We hope that the remainder of this series will keep up to the level of these three volumes, and that it will attain the circulation that it deserves.

E. J. BICKNELL.

JESUS OF NAZARETH: HIS LIFE, TIMES, AND TEACHING. By J. Klausner. Allen and Unwin. 18s.

This book has a remarkable history. It was written in modern Hebrew, the tongue which has been forged in Palestine during recent years and is officially spoken at the Hebrew University of Jerusalem—a magnificent achievement, if successful attempts to add to the curse of Babel are really deserving of admiration. The translation is by Canon Danby, an Anglican priest living at Jerusalem, who conceives the work of a missionary to the Jews on other than conventional lines. Dr. Klausner is a great Jewish scholar, and we shall do well to accept his guidance in those departments of learning in which he is a specialist. But his portrait of our Lord, though very fair from his standpoint, is woefully one-sided.

Let us first look at those points in which he corrects current judgments of Christian scholars in regard to Jewish matters. The Talmud is not only a religious but a legal code. Casuistry and formality are unavoidable in jurisprudence, and it is quite unfair to condemn the Talmud for containing them. In its Haggadistic portions it is a collection of folk-lore, and quite properly includes curious and extravagant legends. Christian scholars almost invariably fail to distinguish between early and late Rabbinic sources when they argue about Jewish views in our Lord's time. Canon Danby in his preface says that in Edersheim's well-known work "there is no pretence at critical sifting or weighing of the Jewish material." And even Schürer "uses but a small fragment of the available Rabbinical material, and much of his treatment, even of that, is open to criticism."

The problem is stated in words uttered by Voltaire: "Though Jesus was a Jew, his followers were not Jews"; and in a saying of Wellhausen: "Jesus was not a Christian; he was a Jew." Klausner describes the Jewish background of the Gospels with great care, and then proceeds to sketch the life and teaching of Jesus on this background. His pages teem with illuminating remarks. We have no space in which to prove how valuable they are to the New Testament student. Rather we would show wherein this sincere seeker after truth differs from us in his estimate

of Jesus. This is surely one of the crucial points of theological controversy to-day. While scientific objections to Christianity are urged with far less confidence than formerly, historical difficulties are greater. It *is* a stumbling-block when a deeply religious and very learned scholar rises from his study of Jesus with a conviction that here is a character not wholly admirable. Yet his very objections carry with them the answers which a Christian would make. We select four of his conclusions.

1. Klausner frequently says: *Ex nihilo nihil fit.* That the Church presently became Gentile shows that its founder was not wholly Jewish. John the Baptist plants a tiny seed destined to grow to mighty proportions when he says that God is able of these stones to raise up children to Abraham. But is not this just what we claim, that Jesus was universal in His humanity—though assuming the form of a first century Jew, He transcended nationalist limitations? A modern Jew, the product of an age-long nationalist development within rigidly defined limits, is gravely handicapped in trying to comprehend this universal human Figure.

2. Klausner compares Jesus with Hillel unfavourably. Hillel "was a moralist of high degree. . . . He took up his position in the centre of affairs, laboured together with the community . . . embodied just such ethical standards as were possible in practice, and thus sanctified and raised the tone of ordinary, everyday life." "Jesus surpassed Hillel in his ethical ideals . . . but his teaching has not proved possible in practice" (pp. 396, 397). We accept the formulation of the difference between the two figures, and ground our belief in the Divinity of Jesus partly on the fact that His teaching is impossibly difficult.

3. "Jesus possesses a belief in his mission which verges on the extreme of self-veneration" (p. 408). What repels the Jew draws the Christian, who sees no reason to think that the belief was not justified.

4. Klausner can accept the teaching of Jesus as one of the choicest treasures of Israel if only "this ethical code be stripped of its wrappings of miracles and mysticism" (p. 414). Morality stripped of the transcendental and of mysticism! Buddhists, Hindus and Moslems would join with Christians in rejecting this as a desirable conception of religion.

We are grateful to Dr. Klausner, not only for his splendid illumination of the Jewish background of the New Testament, but also for his clear formulation of the radical divergence of outlook between Jews and Christians.

W. K. L. Clarke.

Johannes Scotus Erigena: A Study in Mediæval Philosophy. By Henry Bett, M.A. Cambridge University Press. 1925. 10s. net.

There are not wanting signs of a revival of interest in Scholasticism. Mr. Bett's study in mediæval philosophy is thus opportune, and he has rendered a service to scholarship by helping to fill a gap in English philosophical literature by something approaching to a complete treatise on Erigena. By means of this monograph the English reader is able to acquaint himself with the essence of the thought of one who is regarded as the greatest thinker of the ninth century. An introductory chapter on the life and writings of Erigena is followed by a summary of his philosophy, almost wholly in his own words, from his treatise *de Divisione Naturæ.* The immense amount of repetition in the work and the large tracts of it which consist of nothing but lengthy allegorical expositions

of Scripture are all disregarded, and Mr. Bett is thus able to present a summary of the philosophy which omits nothing of any real significance, and yet is scarcely one-tenth of the bulk of the original. The reader can thus pass easily from one subject to another by means of the headlines, and find the essential thought of the philosopher on any particular doctrine. Mr. Bett, however, gives us a third chapter which is a very elaborate exposition of the philosophy, a fourth chapter on sources and authorities, and a final chapter dealing with the influence of Erigena upon later times. In this way he has produced a volume indispensable to students.

BOOK NOTES

The Cross of Jeremiah. By H. W. Robinson. S.C.M. 2s. 6d. Bible students will be glad to know of these four short lectures, throwing light on a difficult book. The great messages of Amos and Hosea had been given, 2 Isaiah lay in the future. Between them came a life rather than a message, a life most worth studying of all in the Old Testament, for it prefigured the suffering Christ. Did not some say He was Jeremiah returned to earth ?

The School of Sanctity. Retreat Addresses. By Frank Weston, D.D., late Bishop of Zanzibar. Mowbray. 4s. 6d. Here we have three courses of hitherto unpublished addresses on the Sacred Heart, Gifts of the Spirit, and Principles of the Passion. The many who revered the speaker will be glad to possess this reminder of his conscience-probing utterances. Those who are not familiar with his books would be well advised to purchase one of the earlier volumes, for the Bishop is not at his best here.

The Faith of an English Catholic. By Darwell Stone, D.D. Longmans. 4s. This book is written to satisfy the demand "somewhat insistently made that Anglo-Catholics should show their hand, and explain what they mean, and say what they want." The author expresses himself uncompromisingly but very courteously. The exposition follows familiar lines, and will be very useful to those who are not clear in their minds as to the position of those whom Dr. Stone may be supposed to represent. The conclusion of the book points to the establishment of a working compromise in the National Church on the lines of the Elizabethan compromise.

The Cornish Church Guide. Blackford (Truro). 3s. 6d. The Truro Diocesan Directory appears in a new form. Besides the usual diocesan information, a description is given of every Church in the county, together with short articles on matters of Cornish ecclesiological interest, which will make the volume very welcome to visitors.

W. K. L. C.

PRINTED IN GREAT BRITAIN BY BILLING AND SONS, LTD., GUILDFORD AND ESHER